Statutory division of profits.

	1910	1911
	Francs.	*Francs.*
71 per cent to stockholders	58,523,200.00	61,823,600.00
15 per cent to the Egyptian Government	12,364,056.33	13,061,323.94
10 per cent to the founders of the company	8,242,704.22	8,707,549.29
2 per cent to the administrative officers	1,648,540.85	1,741,509.86
2 per cent to the employees	1,648,540.85	1,741,509.86
Total	82,427,042.25	87,075,492.95

MARY E. QUINN.

Mr. PENROSE obtained the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. PENROSE. I rose to make a motion to adjourn, but the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] informs me that he desires an executive session, and I will therefore withhold the motion.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I move——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I will withhold the motion to accommodate the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, there is one more bill, involving a claim for personal injury, which will only take a moment to consider. It is a very deserving case, and I should like to have it considered. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Mary E. Quinn.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to Mary E. Quinn, whose husband, James H. Quinn, was fatally injured by an accident at the Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass., $1,500.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After four minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that when the Senate adjourns today it be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 25, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24, 1912.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. William Edward Wyatt Hall to be captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from August 23, 1910, to fill the vacancy created June 19, 1912, by the retirement of Capt. John Ernest Reinburg.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

D. Lawrence Groner to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stephen Doherty to be a lieutenant.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John T. G. Stapler to be a lieutenant.

Ensign Jonas H. Ingram to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Asst. Paymaster Richard H. Johnston to be a passed assistant paymaster.

The following-named commanders to be captains:

Joseph Strauss,

Edward W. Eberle, and

William W. Gilmer.

Lieut. Commander Orton P. Jackson to be a commander.

Lieut. Sinclair Gannon to be a lieutenant commander.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

James McC. Murray,

Reuben R. Smith,

Grattan C. Dichman,

Harry A. McClure, and

Samuel A. Clement.

Asst. Surg. Tharos Harlan to be a passed assistant surgeon.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Edwin R. Heflin, De Beque.

IOWA.

Edwin H. Wilson, Cedar Falls.

MISSOURI.

L. H. Johnson, Kennett.

NORTH DAKOTA.

William H. Workman, Bowman.

PENNSYLVANIA.

J. W. Houck, Clymer.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Leonard T. Hoaglin, Platte.

William P. Joseph, Wagner.

VIRGINIA.

John H. Ingram, Charlotte Court House.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *July 24, 1912.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou to whom we are responsible for every act, quicken, we beseech Thee, our conscience and clarify our spiritual vision, that we may make straight our paths by the absolute truth of our speech and the rectitude of our behavior, that peace and righteousness may possess our souls now and always. In the spirit of the world's great Exemplar. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 4012. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands with the State of Michigan.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 7027. An act to prohibit the importation and the interstate transportation of films or other pictorial representations of prize fights, and for other purposes; and

S. 4948. An act relating to inherited estates in the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the unfinished business is the bill (H. R. 18787) relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon a public work of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and of all persons employed in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

ASSISTANCE AND SALVAGE AT SEA.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 23111) to carry into effect provisions of an international convention for the unification of certain rules with respect to assistance and salvage at sea, and to take up a similar Senate bill, S. 4930, from the Speaker's table and to consider and pass the same. I do not think there is any objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some idea of how long it would take to dispose of the proposition presented by the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SULZER. It will take only a couple of minutes.

Mr. KENDALL. It will not be a contested matter.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I will say that there is no objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri so far as the Committee on Foreign Affairs is concerned. The House bill was considered by that committee and was to be reported favorably, but was held in the committee pending advices from the Belgian Government through the State Department. We now have advices that ratifications of the treaty have been deposited with the Belgian Government, and hence this bill should be passed at the earliest possible moment. It is a meritorious measure. There can be no substantial objection to its present consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire why the great hurry for passing this on Calendar Wednesday. It seems to me that we ought not to mutilate Calendar Wednesday too much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will make this statement on his own account: Ordinarily he would not permit any business of this kind or any other kind to come up and crowd out Calendar Wednesday, even for five minutes; but we are reaching the end of the session—that is, we hope so [applause]—and these matters which are easy to dispose of in short order, it seems to the Chair, should be taken up. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], what the great hurry to pass this bill this morning is?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, there is no great hurry to pass the bill this morning, except that at this late date in the session it is important that this legislation should be enacted into law. I consulted the gentlemen who have the call to-day, and they said if it did not take more than a few minutes they would not object. I am not trying to obstruct the business of Calendar Wednesday and simply wish to get the bill through if possible, because it is one of great importance and has been pending for some time. The bill has already passed the Senate and is on the Speaker's table. It will not take more than a minute to pass it.

Mr. KENDALL. A similar bill was favorably considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; favorably considered, two months ago.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But, Mr. Speaker, we would like to know something about the time the bill will take.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not think it will take five minutes, unless some one wants to discuss it. If it takes too much time, I shall withdraw the request.

Mr. SULZER. No one, so far as I know, wants to discuss it. It will take only a minute to pass it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it the request is to take the Senate bill from the Speaker's table?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I think the bill should be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4930) to harmonize the national law of salvage with the provisions of the international convention for the unification of certain rules with respect to assistance and salvage at sea, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the right to remuneration for assistance or salvage services shall not be affected by common ownership of the vessels rendering and receiving such assistance or salvage services.

SEC. 2. That the master or person in charge of a vessel shall, so far as he can do so without serious danger to his own vessel, crew, or passengers, render assistance to every person who is found at sea in danger of being lost; and if he fails to do so, he shall, upon conviction, be liable to a penalty of not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or both.

SEC. 3. That salvors of human life, who have taken part in the services rendered on the occasion of the accident giving rise to salvage, are entitled to a fair share of the remuneration awarded to the salvors of the vessel, her cargo, and accessories.

SEC. 4. That a suit for the recovery of remuneration for rendering assistance or salvage services shall not be maintainable if brought later than two years from the date when such assistance or salvage was rendered, unless the court in which the suit is brought shall be satisfied that during such period there had not been any reasonable opportunity of arresting the assisted or salved vessel within the jurisdiction of the court or within the territorial waters of the country in which the libelant resides or has his principal place of business.

SEC. 5. That nothing in this act shall be construed as applying to ships of war or to Government ships appropriated exclusively to a public service.

SEC. 6. That this act shall take effect and be in force on and after July 1, 1912.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, still reserving the right to object, I understand from the gentleman that this bill is to carry out the terms of an international conference and that it meets the approval of the State Department and also of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will again report the bill by title.

The Clerk again reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Missouri is to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of the House bill H. R. 23111 and to take up the bill S. 4930 and consider the same. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 23111 was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD in connection with this matter a letter from the Secretary of State and advices from the Belgian Government.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter and advices are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 17, 1912.

The Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Referring to the department's letter of the 17th ultimo, in regard to the bill H. R. 23111, now under consideration by your committee, "To carry into effect the provisions of a convention for the unification of certain rules with respect to assistance and salvage at sea," I have the honor to inclose for your information in connection with the matter a translation of a note from the Belgian minister at this capital.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
P. C. KNOX.

(Inclosure: from Belgian minister, July 6, 1912.)

(Translation.)

LEGATION OF BELGIUM,
Washington, July 6, 1912.

His Excellency the Hon. PHILANDER CHASE KNOX,
Secretary of State, at Washington.

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: The international conventions with respect to collisions and to assistance and salvage at sea which were signed at Brussels, September 23, 1912, contain in articles 16 and 18, respectively, the following provisions as to their ratification and going into effect:

"The present convention shall be ratified.

"At the expiration of the term of one year at the latest from the date of the signature of the convention the Belgian Government will enter into communication with such Governments of the high contracting parties as shall have declared their readiness to ratify it, to the end of coming to a decision as to whether it is proper to put it into force.

"The ratifications will, the case arising, be immediately deposited at Brussels, and the convention will go into effect one month thereafter.

"The protocol will remain opened for another year to the States represented at the Brussels conference. After that period they could but adhere in accordance with the provisions of article 15 (17)."

As is known, the reason why the formality of ratification was deferred is that in many of the signatory countries the conventions could not receive legislative sanction in good time.

It appears from the information in the hands of the King's Government that a certain number of powers are now in position to ratify the conventions.

They are Germany, Belgium, the United States of America (as regards the convention relative to salvage, the collision conventions not having yet secured legislative approval), Great Britain (His Britannic Majesty's Government would at the same time adhere for British India, the Crown colonies and protectorates possessing sea coasts, Cyprus, and the South African Union), Greece, Mexico, Roumania, and Russia.

Several of these countries have even expressed a desire to be allowed to deposit their ratifications at this time.

It would thus seem that the time has come to take up the question of putting the conventions into force. The King's Government believes it may suggest the date of October 1 next to that effect. The ratifications should then, under the provisions quoted above, be deposited one month earlier; the protocol of deposit of ratifications would bear date September 1, 1912.

According to the information obtained by the King's Government it seems certain that countries other than those above named, France notably, will be in a position to ratify the conventions before September 1. In any event, in accordance with the provisions above referred to, the protocol will remain open for one year to the signatory powers which could not ratify on that date.

The King's Government indulges the hope that the dates above indicated will meet with the approval of the American Government, and

that it will be able, on the 1st day of September next, to ratify not only the salvage convention, but also that dealing with collisions.

I have been instructed by my Government to forward this communication to your excellency.

I embrace this opportunity, Mr. Secretary of State, to offer to your excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

E. HAVENITH.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 20728) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and ask unanimous consent to disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Indian appropriation bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20728) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it will take an hour or more to report the amendments, which I do not think will be necessary. I will say to the gentleman when that is done I desire to occupy a little time on the subject, and I think the gentleman would not desire to have that done to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

BILLS ON THE UNANIMOUS-CONSENT CALENDAR.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Monday, *unanimous-consent* day, the Unanimous Consent Calendar was not finished. There are five Mondays in this month. There are still bills pending on that calendar—a very large calendar—and I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, which is the fifth Monday in the month, that business which is in order on unanimous-consent day, suspension day, may be in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that business which is in order on the first and third Mondays—unanimous consent, suspension of the rules, discharge of the committees—shall be in order next Monday, which is the fifth Monday. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The call of the House rests with the Committee on Labor, and the unfinished business is the bill H. R. 18787. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of that bill, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] will take the chair.

LIMITATION OF HOURS OF EMPLOYEES ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18787, with Mr. PAGE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18787) relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon a public work of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and of all persons employed in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the purposes of this bill are similar to other eight-hour bills which have been considered by the Congress from time to time, I believe, since 1868. This particular bill has been made necessary due to a decision rendered by the Supreme Court defining dredge workers as seamen, and therefore claiming that the eight-hour bill enacted in 1892 did not apply, and in regard to that I want to read to the committee extracts from the dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Moody, as follows:

I am unable to agree with the opinion of the court so far as it relates to the employment for more than eight hours a day of men engaged in work on the dredges and scows. * * *

The first question is whether the men named in the information were employed by the defendants "upon any of the public works of the United States" within the meaning of those words as Congress used them. * * * The dredging of channels in our waterways is not mere digging. It has for its purpose the creation of something with as visible a form as a cellar to a house, etc. Surely all these are works, and, if constructed by the Government, "public works." * * * For example, the appropriation for one of these works in question in these cases is in the following terms: "The following sums of money * * * are hereby appropriated * * * for the construction * * * of the public works hereinafter named. * * * For improving said harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 119, Fifty-sixth Congress, second session, by providing channels 35 feet deep, * * * $600,000." That is to say, at the very threshold of the inquiry we find that the Congress which had forbidden a longer day's work than 8 hours upon "the public works of the United States" had, upon undertaking this very work, deliberately called it a "public work."

The cogency of the argument arising from the use of the same words in the eight-hour law as in the appropriation law can not be met by the suggestion that it is easy to read the words in the eight-hour law in a narrower sense than they were used in the appropriation law. The question here is not how the words may be interpreted, but how they ought to be interpreted. There is no necessity to explore the possibilities of escape from the intention which Congress has made sufficiently plain. * * *

The second question is whether the men named in the information were laborers or mechanics. * * * The men who were employed upon the dredges were not seamen, in respect of the work they were actually doing. The master and engineer of the dredge were not licensed, and the men employed upon it seemed not to have entered into any contract of shipment. * * * All those who were engaged in the work may be described as either laborers or mechanics. They had nothing whatever to do with navigation. They were towed to the place where the work was to be done and there left to do it.

It does not seem to be important that for some purposes the scows and dredges were vessels, or those employed upon them for some purposes are deemed seamen. The question here is what were the men when they were engaged in the work of excavation? Were the men at that time employed as seamen, doing the work of seamen, or as laborers and mechanics, doing the work of laborers and mechanics? I think they then were laborers and mechanics, and employed as such, and that their occupation is determined not by what they have been in the past, or by what their employers chose to call them, but by what they were doing when the Government invoked the law for their benefit. * * * Nor was their work in dredging incident to their employment on the dredges, but quite the reverse. They never would have been employed at all except for dredging. They never would have set foot on the dredge save to use it as a platform on which to do the work of laborers and mechanics. * * * They were employed to do the work of laborers and mechanics; in the main they actually did that work, and whatever they did which was of the nature of seamen's work was a mere incident to the fact that they labored upon a floating platform instead of upon the dry land. * * * When the intention of the legislature is reasonably clear, the courts have no duty except to carry it out. The rule for the construction of penal statutes is satisfied if the words are not enlarged beyond their natural meaning, and it does not require that they shall be restricted to less than that.

I am authorized to say that Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice Day concur in this dissent.

I probably should have stated first, Mr. Chairman, that this decision was rendered, I think, in about 1906, some years after this law had been passed, and was supposed to cover work of this nature; and, I think, about 1906 there were prosecutions started against those who had violated this law, and they were convicted and penalized, and this decision was the result of an appeal to the Supreme Court; and it is very evident that judges who render decisions of this character do it because they are rendering these decisions as they think the law ought to be, not as the law reads. There has never been a time before that dredge workers were classed as seamen, and it is apparent—to me at least— that they were called seamen at that time by the employers and by the judges for the purpose of blocking the efforts of Congress to reduce the hours of those engaged in this labor from 12 to 8. Now, for the information of the Members here present I want to say it is not my purpose to take up much time—I do not believe it is necessary, because I think the matter is generally understood—but I would like, however, to give some statements which were made by the secretary and treasurer of the steam shovel and dredgemen's organization, Mr. Thomas J. Dolan, who I believe is a man who has the confidence of the employers as well as the employees; and he states that he and his associates represented about 100,000 men, not claiming that they are all working at the class of work that this bill will cover, due to the fact it is difficult to organize that class of men.

In answer to the questions that were asked Mr. Dolan as to improvements in this kind of work, he stated before the committee in the hearings that the efficiency of the men has been increased more than 100 per cent; in other words, that the workmen to-day are doing more than double the amount of work which they did some 15 or 20 years ago, and that it seems to be largely due to the fact that through organization they are able to secure better conditions, and, therefore, the workmen are more efficient.

Also, Mr. Martin Cole, representing the Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association, has stated that the increased productive powers, due to the new methods of production in this industry and efficiency of workmen together, has increased from 1,000 to 1,500 yards daily to 6,000 to 7,000 yards daily. In other words, the new equipments of to-day, with the improved efficiency of the workmen, have increased the productive power of work of this nature from 1,000 to 1,500 yards a day to 6,000 to 7,000

yards a day. It does seem to me that the men who are a part of this industry are entitled to some of the benefits of this increased production in the way of reduction of hours, even though it might reduce their productive capacity to a small extent.

I do not feel that it is necessary for me to take any further time of the House in regard to this matter, and I will close by saying that in this age there is certainly not anyone who desires to oppose the reduction of hours, and especially in cases where it is shown they are working from 12 to 14 hours, and no objections to this bill which provides for putting the work under the eight-hour system, as we have done with other work for which the Government contracts. And it can be done, in my judgment, without a great hardship upon the contractors who are employing these workmen.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL]?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not, if this bill becomes a law, the levee work provided for by the bill which was passed several days ago, and which was declared under the terms of that bill to be "extraordinary emergency work" would be excluded from the terms of the eight-hour law?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This exempts extraordinary emergency work. At the bottom of page 2 it reads:

Except in cases of extraordinary emergency.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Then, do I understand you to say that in your judgment the words which I show you here in the river and harbor act, on page 48 of the bill, as presented to the House, reading, "which shall be considered extraordinary emergency work," would be considered as exempting this work from the terms of your bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wish to say, unless it is extraordinary emergency work, I would not want it excluded. If this work becomes extraordinary emergency work, due to the fact that there shall be a loss of property or life, then this provision in the bill excludes it. I do not know why it is defined as "extraordinary emergency work." Possibly it was because a property loss would result unless this was done as emergency work, and it has to be expedited as fast as possible. I do not know of any other reason why Congress would put such a provision in the bill.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. That is true beyond question. I was simply asking the gentleman what his construction of the use of these words would be, as to exempting the levee work from the terms of your bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say, so far as I can see the words are the same, unless the work has been wrongly defined, and unless the work has been wrongly defined I suppose it would exclude it, in my opinion, as long as you have it in that paragraph.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I wish to ask the gentleman a question. I notice on line 12, page 2, of the bill these words are used:

Which eight hours shall terminate within nine hours from the beginning of workday.

Now, under the strict construction of those words I would like to ask you how many shifts will be required to take care of the operation of locks on rivers or canals where boats are required to pass through during all portions of the night and day.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not believe I understood the question.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. To repeat my question: Under the terms of this bill, which reads, "Which eight hours shall terminate within nine hours from the beginning of workday," suppose we have a case of a lock on some river where perhaps there are not more than 8 or 10 boats passing during the day—in other words, not more than 8 or 10 lockages during the day. The lock keeper lives in a house adjacent to the lock, and yet he can not serve for more than nine hours from the time he begins work, when he must quit his duty. Would not that require, in the case I have stated, three shifts of men to take care of that lock?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think it would.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. And do you not think that might be made an exception from the general terms of the bill? I wish to say to the gentleman that I am heartily in accord with the general terms of his bill, but I ask him if he does not think in that case there might be an exception?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, there are probably cases it would be reasonable to define as exceptions; but I find that where you make exceptions in matters of this kind they are always abused, and one of the reasons why we made this provision which you speak of in the bill is because the representatives of the tug workers complained that their work had been strung out over, we will say, 16 hours a day. Possibly while not actual work for that length of time, it was, of course, the same, because they had to spend the time there on the job. It was to prevent the abuses they complained of in regard to that that we put the provision in there. There may be circumstances that would appeal to one as being exceptions to the rule. Now, we have our police forces, for instance, and clerks often that do not have any hard work to do and their work is not continuous. Still it is generally considered that about eight hours are sufficient for workmen of any kind, whether the work is mental or otherwise, in order that the workmen should be most efficient to do the work.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Now, in regard to cooks and waiters, for instance, on the tugs and dredge boats. I assume that they have to get up pretty early in the morning and get the breakfast ready an hour or two, at any rate, before the crew would begin work. They certainly must have a good deal of rest time during the day, and unless you would except them from the terms of this bill you would have to have two sets of cooks and two sets of waiters, would you not? I am simply calling this matter to the gentleman's attention, so that he may present an amendment which would accommodate the bill to the purposes for which it was drawn and yet not work great hardships in some of these isolated cases.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not familiar with the work of cooks and waiters on the boats. I suppose, though, in cases where they work three shifts, their hours should be shortened in some manner or other. I am not prepared to answer whether it is proper to shorten the time of cooks or not. I am not prepared to answer that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the class just mentioned by the gentleman from Louisiana, I would like to suggest another, such, for instance, as master's mates and the like of dredge boats, who in many instances must necessarily be on duty more than eight hours at a time, nor do I understand they wish to come under the 8-hour law. Now, this 8-hour provision, as I see it, might be very readily applied to operators of dredging machinery who live on shore, as many do, simply going on board of a dredge during the day, but hardly to those working irregularly or to master's mates, crews of vessels, and the like. Its application to them, it seems to me, might in many instances result in the smallest amount of labor for the daily wage and often in the doubling and trebling of the number of employees doing a given kind of work. To require the contractors to have two or three shifts during the 24 hours might be putting an unnecessary hardship on the Government, without any compensating benefit to the laboring classes or to the people at large.

I want to say right here, as was said by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], that I am thoroughly in sympathy with this class of legislation, and sincerely believe in the application of the 8-hour law to laborers and mechanics, in short, to nearly all classes of steady workers. But where a person works irregularly or intermittently, I doubt if he should be subjected to a provision such as the 9-hour provision in lines 12 and 13 of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That bears out what I said a moment ago. The minute you start to make exceptions there is always somebody who will want to make the exceptions general. The fact is that eight hours' work is sufficient for any man per day, whether he is at actual hard labor or not, because, taking in the time that he uses in getting to and from his work, a man is usually required to spend 10 hours of his time in performing eight hours' work. The workman who usually works eight hours is away from home generally 10 hours, because it usually takes him an hour to get to his work and get ready, and also an hour to get away, and so forth. The minute you start to talk about exceptions, it seems, the next you know is that you have got them generally applying to everything.

Now, the conditions that are maintained at this time on certain kinds of dredge work are such that, in my opinion, the lives of the men working thereon are a blank, so far as concerns their having any intercourse or association with any sort of society, except with those who work with them. In some cases they go out and work for a week or for a month on a single trip. In olden times, I believe, it was stated that they stayed out for a month at a time, and when they did get back to civilization, as was said by one of the witnesses who was before the committee, they tried to take in everything in about half a day or so, and that condition tends to degenerate the human kind.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not criticizing the general purposes of the bill. I will say to the gentleman I favor its passage.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, the same argument has been made at all times when you have tried to secure a reduction of hours. Now, I am not stating that the gentleman who makes the inquiry looks at it from that point of view, but it seems to me that not only in the recent past, but for ages, anything that may interfere with profit has been looked upon with disfavor, and the dollar has stood above the man. In the consideration of these measures one reason why we have made such slow progress in our battle for shorter hours in this country and in Europe for the last 100 years is the fact and the argument that there is danger of interfering with the profit of the manufacturer or the employer. It is true that the reduction of hours, as has been shown time and time again, has brought about an improvement to the workman and an increase of his efficiency, and probably in the run of years has produced no loss to the manufacturer or employer; and yet that argument has borne and *still* bears most heavily against us. However, we are getting away from that to a certain extent, as I hope and believe, and I believe that the gentleman himself has gotten away from it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I understand thoroughly and am in sympathy with the intention of the bill, but, in my opinion, exceptions ought to be made. You can not make a law applicable to all conditions. Exceptional conditions arise, and they should be taken into consideration when we legislate.

But here is what I want to ask of the gentleman: I understand, of course, that we should not always take into account the matter of expense, but has the gentleman considered how great the additional expense would be to the Government in the matter of river and harbor work if the bill passes in its present shape?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, judging from past experiences in regard to the reduction of hours in other industries, I think the expense will not be great. I will say, however, that if it were I would still be in favor of the bill just the same, because I believe in putting humanity above the matter of dollars. But in my judgment, based on past experience, the additional expense to be incurred would not be great.

I want to call my friend's attention to the difficulty of making provisions such as the gentleman is speaking of. This law, for instance, has been made necessary in order to protect certain workers, because of the fact that employers have continually tried to evade the law. The adoption of the eight-hour law in 1892 was made necessary owing to the fact that not only employers, but the department officials, were endeavoring to evade the law, and there are decisions of judges the effect of which is to nullify the provisions of the law. I might read to you what President Grant had to say about the law of 1868. He issued a proclamation on May 19, 1869, for the purpose of checking abuses which were preventing the generous objects of the statute, by declaring that from and after that date no reduction should be made in the wages paid by the Government by the day to such laborers, workmen, and mechanics on account of the reduction in the hours.

He issued another proclamation on the same question in 1872. In order to evade the provision of this law the Department of Justice had held that the act of June 25, 1868, was not applicable to mechanics, workmen, and laborers in the employ of contractors with the United States; that the act was not intended to extend to any others than the immediate employees of the Government; and in United States against Martin the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision in respect to the eight-hour law of 1868 which practically destroyed that law and defeated the good intention of the legislators who enacted it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not wish to be understood as opposing the bill. I am in favor of it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am pointing out these things to the gentleman to show why it is practically impossible to include the provision to which he refers. If it is included, it will be applied to everything in the industry, as it has been applied, by the assistance of the Federal judges.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know that it is true, but I am informed by what I consider competent authority that this provision will add to the cost of river and harbor work perhaps 50 per cent. I refer more particularly to the language in lines 12 and 13, page 2:

> Which eight hours shall terminate within nine hours from beginning of workday.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Such a statement is erroneous.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know how much the cost would be increased, but I know it would be very greatly increased.

I notice there is a difference made in here between the contractor or subcontractor on work other than river and harbor work done by the Government or its contractors and on river and harbor work. Perhaps I can best show what I mean by quoting the first part of section 1:

> SECTION 1. That the service and employment of all laborers and mechanics who are now or may hereafter be employed by the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia, or by any contractor or subcontractor, upon a public work of the United States or of the District of Columbia.

That refers to work other than river and harbor work, while the provision in regard to rivers and harbors seems to be much broader.

Why is this distinction made in river and harbor work and all other classes of Government work?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am of the opinion that this is similar to the other eight-hour measures. I do not think there is much difference. The intention is the same. The arbitrary decision of judges, who apparently have seen things through the eyes of the employer for profit instead of taking the humane side of the question, have made it necessary in drawing many bills to make the language broader, or else the language will be defined as meaning something else than what those who enacted the law intended. If it is any broader, that is probably the reason for it.

Mr. BATHRICK. May I ask a question? The statement has been made, has it not, that this bill would increase the cost 50 per cent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have known from the engineer's department that it will probably reach that figure, at least 50 per cent, and one of them put it much higher than that.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that on all the hearings upon the subject of the reduction of the hours of labor of workmen employed upon Government contract work to eight hours, it has been demonstrated and stated by the contractors themselves that the difference in cost would not exceed in the neighborhood of 10 per cent, and I can not understand how this reduction of hours would exceed 10 per cent. I can not understand upon what basis anybody should make the statement that it would increase the cost 50 per cent.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Such a statement is erroneous.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that has been the argument of all of the opponents of the eight-hour bills or bills for the reduction of hours of any kind for the last 100 years. In England in 1802 when they cut down the hours of apprentices to 72 a week the manufacturers there said that it was going to put them out of business. The same argument has been made from that time to this not only in this country but in the European countries by the employers of the country that the excessive cost would make it impossible to comply with it. That is an erroneous argument, and it does not have much weight with me, although I am always glad to listen to any side of a question. It is not my purpose, and never has been, to obstruct the business of this country, but I claim that any law which tends to protect humanity not only does not obstruct business but that it adds to business and strengthens and improves it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with patience, and this is the first time that I have heard it stated that it has been estimated anywhere that it would increase the cost of production 50 per cent. Will the gentleman please inform me where that suggestion comes from?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] made the statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I made the suggestion that it had been stated to me that the enactment of this bill into law, as it now stands, would cost the Government anywhere from 33⅓ per cent to 50 per cent. One of the engineers placed it even higher than that. A statement made by the gentleman from Illinois a while ago would show that in one class of work it would likely increase the cost at least 200 per cent. He admitted that where there is only one set of men now needed in the opening or tending of locks, this bill would require three. In other words, three shifts. They would certainly increase the cost as much as 200 per cent anyway.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is now speaking of river and harbor work?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what we were discussing; yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Has that been the subject of discussion between the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged for the information.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It has hardly been a discussion. It was more of a colloquy.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, how would it be possible to increase the cost by 50 per cent, the cost of dredging, if the

labor were increased only about 20 per cent and increased efficiency would flow from shorter hours?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state the ridiculous position in which the Government has been in regard to this eight-hour-a-day matter, and I want to read a part of the hearings to bear out what I say. Mr. W. B. Jones, the general president of the International Dredge Workers' Protective Association, was before the committee, and he said:

Mr. JONES. There has been a great deal of dredging done; take, for instance, the cities of Cleveland and Buffalo.

Mr. MAHER. Did they have regulations providing the eight-hour day?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir; eight-hour day. For illustration, we will take the city of Buffalo, and they did some dredging in the rivers there for the State, in connection with the channel that is going through; the men on this dredging work for the State of New York and the city of Buffalo worked eight hours, on the canal, but the Government building the river or harbor part between the two ends of the canal in Niagara River, that work was let by the Government and that is all done at 12 hours.

Mr. MAHER. Practically all the dredge work is done by the Government, initiated by the State, Navy, or National Government.

Mr. JONES. Yes; some private work, but not to speak of, and the difference is men will be working in sight of one another, some working for the city or State and working eight hours, and others working under Government contract where you could almost throw a stone at one another, and working on the Government work 12 hours. That is, contract let by the Government.

In other words, the Government work was being done under a 12-hour day and the work for the State of New York and the city of Buffalo under an 8-hour day, practically in the same place, under the same conditions, the same structure, and the same canal or harbor. If any gentleman thinks that we should let a condition like that continue, I shall have to differ with him.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman if his bill and this class of legislation will not have a tendency to create a monopoly in the hands of a few men who furnish material to the contractors in doing Government work? In other words, material must be purchased from men whose labor work is done under the eight-hour-a-day law. Take the South, for instance. Suppose there is a contract down there on some of the rivers for Government work or the construction of a building. How can a farmer or a millman who is working a few hands out in the forest and who is able to get the material and yet does not comply with the eight-hour-a-day law furnish any of that material to the Government?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to say to the gentleman that this has nothing to do with material itself. It is Government contract work for rivers and harbors.

Mr. TRIBBLE. But the same principle runs through all Government work, and the gentleman knows that the law forbids Government contractors from purchasing material from anyone who works labor over eight hours.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That may be, but I want to say in regard to the monopoly that it seems that we have already a monopoly in this work. The representative of the Employers' Association, Mr. William C. Ryan, who is a very nice gentleman, the secretary of the Dredge Owners' Protective Association, says that they are organized, and organized for the purpose of stopping the Government doing its own work evidently. That was one of the purposes. The Government had been doing its own work to such an extent that it was about to put the contractors out of business, so they have organized for that purpose and probably now have a monopoly. I am not prepared to state about that, but this will have nothing to do with a monopoly part of it anyway.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman seems to speak officially for the Government employees, and I will ask him to state to what extent this eight-hour-a-day law and the reduction of a day's labor is going to be carried in Government employees? You have come down in the number of hours from year to year. How many more will be required in the course of time? Will the gentleman state what the gentleman thinks ought to be a day's labor?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The requirements of humanity would satisfy me and nothing else.

Mr. TRIBBLE. What does the gentleman think ought to be a day's labor now?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, it is the general opinion at this time that eight hours is a fair day's work. I am not an authority on that question, however.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman if he did not hear Mr. Carroll say in the Committee on Naval Affairs that there would soon be a movement when the men would demand seven and a half hours for Government employees, and does not the gentleman vouch for Mr. Carroll, and did not the gentleman bring Mr. Carroll there? Is not that true? I ask the gentleman if Mr. Carroll did not say a movement was on foot to reduce the hours to seven and a half? Now, will the gentleman answer me that question? Did he say that?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not responsible for what Mr. Carroll says.

Mr. TRIBBLE. You vouch for him.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, that may be true that conditions may require that for humanity, but I wish to say when that question becomes an issue it is time enough to discuss the question.

Mr. TRIBBLE. It seems to me it is the issue now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to read for the benefit of some gentlemen here, and who do not seem to understand—I will ask the gentleman if he is opposed to an eight-hour day?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think that a Government employee has any more right to claim eight hours as a day's labor than the man who works upon the farm.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is not a question of Government employees.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I say that Government employees ought to work just as long as any other employees in this country. I do not propose to make any preference in regard to Government employees.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is not an answer to my question. I asked the gentleman whether he is in favor of the eight-hour day or a shorter working day.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I answered that question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. For the benefit of some gentlemen here I will read this, and then I will yield as soon as I do so. I have an extract here from what Mr. Carroll D. Wright, then Commissioner of Labor, wrote relative to the eight-hour law in the Fifty-fifth Congress. He says:

The policy of this class of legislation has therefore been settled by Congress, and I need not discuss this phase of the question. All such laws are enacted for the purpose of protecting the laboring man from the injurious consequences of prolonged physical effort, giving him more time for his personal affairs, and more time and energy to devote to the cultivation of his moral and mental powers. It has always been expected that they would aid him in the acquisition of knowledge, thus tending to make him a better and more contented citizen. This policy must be admitted by all to be a good one. The only difficulty is in so shaping legislation as not to interfere with necessary economic conditions. The Federal Government has long been committed to this policy; therefore the principle of the proposed bill may be considered as settled and approved.

Now, I want to read further what our martyred President McKinley said in the House of Representatives on August 28, 1890. He said:

And the Government of the United States ought, finally and in good faith, to set this example of eight hours as constituting a day's work required of laboring men in the service of the United States. The tendency of the times the world over is for shorter hours for labor—shorter hours in the interest of health, shorter hours in the interest of humanity, shorter hours in the interest of the home and the family—and the United States can do no better service to labor and to its own citizens than to set the example to States, to corporations, and to individuals employing men by declaring that, so far as the Government is concerned, eight hours shall constitute a day's work and be all that is required of its laboring force.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this bill should be passed. My colleague, Mr. Morey, has stated what we owe the family in this connection, and Cardinal Manning, in a recent article, spoke noble words on the general subject when he said:

"But if the domestic life of the people be vital above all; if the peace, the purity of homes, the education of children, the duties of wives and mothers, the duties of husbands and of fathers, be written in the natural law of mankind, and, if these things are sacred, far beyond anything that can be sold in the market, then I say if the hours of labor resulting from the unregulated sale of a man's strength and skill shall lead to the destruction of domestic life, to the neglect of children, to turning wives and mothers into living machines, and of fathers and husbands into—what shall I say, creatures of burden? I will not say any other word—who rise up before the sun and come back when it is set, wearied and able only to take food and lie down and rest, the domestic life of man exists no longer and we dare not go on in this path."

Mr. Speaker, we owe something to the care, the elevation, the dignity, and the education of labor. We owe something to the workingmen, and the families of the workingmen throughout the United States, who constitute the large body of our population, and this bill is a step in the right direction.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman answer me a question? The gentleman discussed labor in general and employees in general, and I want to ask the gentleman why he makes a distinction between Government employees and other labor. This provides for Government employees.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I make no distinction.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman does in his bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say, for the gentleman's information, it is not my bill.

Mr. TRIBBLE. But you are advocating it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. WILSON] introduced the bill, and I undertook the work of reporting it to the House.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Why does not the gentleman offer an amendment putting all employees in the same category?

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I now yield to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I may ask the gentleman some questions which have already been asked and answered, possibly, because it was impossible on this side to hear most of the questions which were asked and answered. As I understand it, the existing law applies only to laborers and mechanics, and that the courts have construed that it does not apply to men on dredges because, under the construction of the courts, they are seamen.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman states it correctly.

Mr. MANN. The purposes of this bill primarily is to cover these dredgers under the eight-hour law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Let me ask the gentleman this question, if I may: In the case of dredges owned by the Government, men go on the dredge and live there. The same is true concerning dredges owned by contractors. I suppose somebody is in charge of the dredge. I do not know what the title would be—master or captain. Under the provisions of this bill as it stands now, would not every person on the dredge be limited to eight hours' work, not more than nine hours after the commencement of the working day?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think so.

Mr. MANN. Would it be possible to operate a dredge in that way?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, yes; I think so.

Mr. MANN. Now, the language of the bill is——

Mr. BUCHANAN. The fact is, I will say to my colleague, before this law was declared unconstitutional, or before it was declared that dredgemen were seamen, they were working on the eight-hour day——

Mr. MANN. I will say to my colleague that I am perfectly in accord with the desire of the bill, but——

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say that I believe it is practicable.

Mr. MANN. The question is whether it is practicable that the man in charge of the dredge shall be confined to more than eight hours from the beginning of the workday, and that the cooks and anybody else connected with the dredge shall be confined in the same way?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to say that it is my personal opinion, though. Really I had not thought about the cooks and employees of that kind, and I never thought about this law applying to them. I do not consider the man who represents the company on any construction work an employee or workman in the sense that this bill was intended to apply, but he is an agent of the company, and in a different capacity from a workman.

Mr. MANN. I am asking these questions in the hope that we may arrive at some amendment to the bill which would make it workable, and therefore make it practicable to pass it and make it a law. The gentleman will notice that in the original act it says "laborers and mechanics." That, under the construction of the court, is not sufficient to cover the seamen. This bill says that all persons engaged in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor. And, I take it, that that means all persons who are paid out of an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, I will say to my colleague that he has had a much wider experience than I have with these matters. In fact, I did not draft this bill myself.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But we want the bill to be practical. I will say that if there is any amendment that could be offered that would make it more workable, personally I would have no objection to it. I want to say that I am only one, and can not speak for anyone else.

Mr. MANN. I appreciate that. The gentleman knows, however, that, as a rule, one body of Congress may pass a bill which is not likely to pass the other body where there is something in the bill that is objectionable. I was wondering if there was not some description of these men that could be inserted instead of saying "all persons." "All persons" would probably include the United States Army engineers, and from them down to charwomen. It certainly would include the men in charge of the dredge. It certainly is not desirable to have three different men in charge of the dredge at different times as the only person in charge.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Has the gentleman any suggestion to make with regard to the matter?

Mr. MANN. So far as covering "seamen" is concerned, so far as the decision of the court is concerned, it would be sufficient to provide for seamen engaged in river and harbor work, but I am not sure that that is sufficient as a matter of desirability. I have no objection to applying the eight-hour law wherever it can be applied.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The purpose of the bill is, of course, to make it apply to dredge work.

Mr. MANN. Although I could not hear all that was said, take the case that has already been alluded to as to locks. There are certain places where locks are maintained under the river and harbor work. Of course it is perfectly patent that the lock keeper who opens a lock a few times a day has little labor to perform at any time. And there is no reason for keeping three sets of lock keepers. I do not think anyone desires to have that done in the case I mentioned, if there is such a case.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I should think there ought to be some provision to make an exception for such cases, but it is difficult to do it. The purpose of the employers almost invariably is to endeavor to evade the purposes of the law. If it was not for that it would be easy to arrange those things. But the trouble with the eight-hour laws and all other laws for the benefit of labor has been that it is necessary to make them broad, because there has been a tendency on the part of the employer to evade them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

Mr. MANN. How much more time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I can answer some further questions.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I hope the gentleman's time will be extended, as I want to ask him some questions. I ask that his time be extended 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desire to ask further questions?

Mr. MANN. Not at present.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I notice you asked the gentleman from Illinois if he had any suggestions. I have one which might obviate some of the trouble. If you will insert, on line 2, page 2, after the word "mechanics," "and all operators of dredging machinery who live on shore and go on board dredges or other water craft for the day," those words, it seems to me, would obviate the objection as to the owners of the boat, like captains or their representatives, and obviate the trouble about cooks and waiters and employees of that kind, and would accomplish your purpose of protecting those who are now classed under that decision as seamen.

Let me read it again in order that I may make it clear to you. After the words "laborers and mechanics," on line 2, page 2, add "and all operators of dredging machinery who live on shore and go on board dredges or other water craft for the day." Insert those words instead of using the words "all persons," and so forth, on line 6. I simply submit that for your consideration.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The probability is that they would all be living on the vessels.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, a great many of them live on shore.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, I believe they do, especially about the Lakes. I know they do, many of them. It certainly is not a pleasant life to lead on the water, and it seems to me that those who live on the water ought to have eight hours, if anyone else is entitled to it, and they ought to be given an opportunity to be on shore a little more than they are under present conditions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It requires a good deal of time in some cases, I will say to the gentleman, to get these men from the shore to the places where they work, so that in some cases under this 9-hour clause, I am told, they would not actually work more than five or six hours a day. Perhaps, however, those are extreme cases.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think so. I think they are rare cases. From the knowledge I have of the work, I think those cases are exceptions to the rule.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I am in entire harmony with the purpose contained in the bill. I think that all laboring men ought to be included in the general provision restricting the hours of

service to eight hours each day. I understand that the purpose of this bill is to include in the law which was passed a few years ago the men working on dredges engaged in river and harbor work. Am I right in this?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, will the gentleman please tell me why there is any necessity for including in the bill the language I find in italics as follows:

Which eight hours shall terminate in nine hours from beginning of workday.

I had in mind the idea that the hours of labor would always terminate within the time prescribed. The gentleman may have made the explanation, but we did not hear it on this side of the House. I am sorry to ask the gentleman to repeat it, but it needs repetition for the reason stated.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That question was answered. One of the complaints made by the representatives of the men employed in this industry was that the time during which they did work was scattered out. It took them, for example, 16 hours sometimes to perform work representing 12 hours.

Mr. BUTLER. The hours of labor were not continuous, as I understand? They were divided or separated?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes. That is a committee amendment that the gentleman has read—put in for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not understand the purpose of the committee amendment, because I did not appreciate the reason for it.

Now, let me ask the gentleman a further question, and then perhaps I will have the information I desire. At the bottom of page 2 are found these words—

Except in case of extraordinary emergency.

This bill imposes pretty heavy penalties. That would put the responsibility upon the employer of labor to determine whether or not the emergency was an extraordinary one, of course?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. In justice to him, could not that be simplified somewhat?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This is an amendment to the eight-hour law, which, I believe, provides for some one to define what the emergency is.

Mr. BUTLER. That I did not know.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This is an amendment, I say, to the eight-hour law of 1892.

Mr. BUTLER. Then in that law, as I understand, there is some authority to determine whether or not the emergency is extraordinary, is there?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, yes; there is a provision in the eight-hour law which provides for that.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. I wish to say in the beginning that I am heartily in favor of the eight-hour law and of this bill, but I want an explanation of one clause of this bill. The other day a Senate amendment to a bill was concurred in, providing that certain improvements on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers should be regarded as emergency work. It was pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] at that time that that would probably exempt that work from the provisions of the eight-hour law. Now, in connection with that I desire to ask the gentleman what the effect will be of the provision in the last line of page 2, where this language is found—

Except in case of extraordinary emergency.

Perhaps the gentleman has answered the question already, but there was so much confusion that we could not hear on this side.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That question has been answered; yes.

Mr. WILLIS. I could not hear the gentleman's answer.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The language is the same as the bill passed the other day, and inasmuch as that has been defined as an extraordinary emergency, I suppose that this bill will not apply to that particular work.

Mr. WILLIS. Then if this bill passes, notwithstanding the fact that Congress is wisely and properly undertaking to embody the principles of the eight-hour law here, on that river work it will not apply?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I said it would not apply to cases of extraordinary emergency. I do not think the Senate and the House would attempt to do something that they ought not to do, and if Congress have declared something to be an extraordinary emergency that is not one they have done wrong. I think that this destruction of the levees, due to the floods, has made it a work of extraordinary emergency to make life and property secure and possibly in order that the crops may grow without being destroyed and to preserve the health of the people. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] can explain that better than I can. I am not so familiar with the subject as he.

Mr. WILLIS. I will say, further, that an improvement that seeks to avoid a flood a year or so from now is not an extraordinary emergency, and therefore the 8-hour law should apply; but it is provided in that bill that notwithstanding that fact it shall be regarded as emergency work, and consequently the eight-hour law was held not to apply.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I supposed this work was to rebuild what was torn out by the flood. I do not know.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. That is exactly what it is for. It is to restore those great crevasses in the levees which have done such awful damage, and will cost millions of dollars to replace. It is to restore the wave-washed levees. This $4,000,000 will not put the levees back in as good shape as they were in when this extraordinary high water came upon them.

Mr. BUTLER. That should not be considered as emergency work.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. It certainly is emergency work. It is so declared to be in the act. If the gentleman lived down there, back of those levees, and had his property destroyed, as the property of others has been destroyed by these floods, and had the waters finally to recede, and weeks and weeks after the recession found the physical conditions were such that a single pound of dirt could not be moved, and the rains were coming down on him as they have been coming down there nearly ever since the water receded, and as they are liable to continue to come; and if he will consider the fact that millions of yards of dirt will have to be put there to restore those levees, he would surely think it extraordinary emergency work to get those crevasses closed and put those levees in condition for the next high water. Not only must we finish the levees, but we must revet them with grass. We plant Bermuda grass on them, and that work must be done quickly in order to have the grass take root and form a protective sod to prevent wave wash.

If any kind of work of which I have knowledge can be considered extraordinary emergency, it seems to me it is that, and the Congress declared it to be so in the river and harbor bill which passed just a few days ago.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman one further question. I am simply seeking to get at the facts. I understand the gentleman to agree in the interpretation of the proposed law which has been placed upon it by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], that if this bill passes this $6,000,000 will be expended outside of the provisions of the eight-hour law.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Only the part applying to levees. The portion of the $6,000,000 which applies to levees, to wit, $4,000,000, is declared by the river and harbor bill to be for extraordinary emergency work. I do not know that this provision will apply to levee work under subsequent acts of Congress, but that part of the appropriation in the act recently passed is declared to be "extraordinary emergency work," and I think under the terms of the bill which we now have before us the words:

Except in case of extraordinary emergency—

Lines 23 and 24, page 2, would except the levee work which will be done under the river and harbor act passed a few days ago from the general provisions of the pending bill if it become law.

Mr. WILLIS. Then, if I correctly understand the gentleman, the sum of $4,000,000 will be expended outside of the provisions of the eight-hour law.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the language quoted from lines 24 and 25, page 2, of this bill are existing law. The bill does not propose to change existing law, so far as that language is concerned. And even if the appropriation bill referred to had not contained the language that is in it, if the department engaged in the execution of this work had determined that this work on the levees was extraordinary emergency work, the $4,000,000 could have been expended under the existing eight-hour law without regard to an eight-hour workday. The insertion of the clause in the appropriation bill simply gave the expression of the Congress to the fact that it was extraordinary emergency work, and the legislative branch of the Government thereby assumed the responsibility of declaring that it was extraordinary emergency work. The passage of this bill

would not in any manner change that, because it provides for the exemption from the operations of an eight-hour workday all work that is of an extraordinary emergency character. So this bill would not in any manner affect the appropriation to which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] refers.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, 21 States of the Union have eight-hour laws applicable to labor on public works and to State employees. These laws have been adopted within the period of the last 21 years. Colorado, Kansas, New York, and Utah have each furnished a precedent—after long-continued struggles over the question—of the constitutionality of eight-hour laws and their applicability to public works done by contractors.

It is apparent to me that a large majority of our citizens are favorable to a shorter workday or the eight-hour law, because in States like Colorado in the West and New York in the East, where it has been necessary to revise the State constitutions to secure an eight-hour law, the people have voted strongly in favor of it.

In Colorado a law was enacted in March, 1899, providing for eight hours in mines, smelters, and blast furnaces, but in the ensuing October the supreme court of the State unanimously decided it to be unconstitutional. On November 4, 1902, a constitutional amendment embodying the terms of this law, which had been approved by all the political parties, was submitted to the people under the referendum at the general election and adopted by a vote of 72,980 yeas to 26,266 nays. The general assembly of Colorado at the close of its next session, from January 7 to April 6, 1903, adjourned without enacting an eight-hour law, as directed by this constitutional amendment, but in 1905 it passed a law which in part resembles the organic act, but is inadequate, reflecting neither its letter or spirit.

In New York an eight-hour "public works" law, with a "prevailing rate of wages" clause, was enacted in 1897 and amended in 1899 and again in 1900. The "prevailing rate of wages" clause was decided to be unconstitutional, as was also any penalty for the violation of the eight-hour provision.

In 1905, however, the people, by means of the referendum, adopted the following amendment to the constitution by a vote of 338,570 ayes and 133,606 nays:

> The legislature may regulate and fix the salaries, the hours of labor, and make provision for the protection, welfare, and safety of persons employed by the State or by any county, city, town, or other civil division of the State or by any contractor or subcontractor performing work, labor, or services for the State or for any county, city, town, village, or other civil division thereof.

In accordance with this constitutional amendment the legislature of 1906 enacted the present law, which, with an amendment adopted in 1907 extending its scope, is regarded as efficient and satisfactory to the wageworkers of the State. In a case in which the comptroller of New York City refused to pay for work performed in violation of the law, the contractor secured a writ directing payment, but on appeal by the comptroller the court of appeals, the highest court of the State, sustained the law with this significant expression of opinion:

> The constitution was amended because it did not confer power upon the legislature to fix and regulate the hours of labor in doing public work or the wages to be paid. * * * The legislature acted under the amendment and reenacted the precise law, the overthrow of which by the courts made the amendment necessary. * * * The people in exercising their supreme power did not do a vain act, but effected a definite purpose. * * * We uphold the statute simply because the people have so amended the constitution as to permit such legislation. The command of the people made in the form prescribed by law must be enforced by the courts.

At the present stage of the discussion of reducing the hours of the workday it is no longer necessary to set out to prove the benefits to mankind gained everywhere in industrial life through cutting off all the hours of employment above 10. On the shelves of every public library in our cities are books and reports by the score telling of communities made more healthy, more sober, more happy, more enlightened by removing the burden of the intolerably excessive toil to which the workers generally were formerly driven. To lop off the 2, 3, and even 4 hours above 10 was a long step toward substituting humanity for brutality. More than that, economically nothing was lost. At the end of the year the worker on the average yielded as much output at 10 hours as at the longer day. He worked more days, he applied more muscle to his task, and he rose from an automaton drudge to an intelligent mechanic. It is also to be noted that every reduction in the hours of daily labor has been followed by new and better tools and devices by which the productivity of the workers working under an eight-hour day has been vastly increased over the former long-hour workday.

With the progressive intensity of application under modern methods and speeded-up machinery, workmen by daily experience know, and with hardly an exception the trained and careful investigators of working-class life employed by either the Government or sociological agencies are by diversified observation convinced that 10 hours in an industrial pursuit strain the nerves and weaken the general physique of even strong men, the total result being a detriment to the race. With the recent necessarily changed modes of living, especially in large communities, the 10 hours at work mean more nearly 12 hours' absence from home, transit to and from the work place being included.

The laborer's strength diminishes gradually in the course of the day. The last hours count against him most. Bodily ailments then develop in his weak spots. The quality of his work then falls off. His aversion, born of weakness and exhaustion, then takes root toward the natural avocations of a healthy nature in the hours off from the daily grind. It is then that, with a certain percentage of the worn-out toilers, a craving for stimulant arises, foreshadowing the deplorable consequence of indulgence in drink. It is then that the workman is unfitted to take part during the evenings in the various duties of his life; hence he is the less worthy as a citizen, the less helpful to the constructive institutions of society, the less a watchful, patient, and competent father of a family.

The testimony as to what the wageworkers who enjoy the eight-hour day have done with the two hours now their own which once were given to the employer is to be seen in a number of callings in many parts of the country. One effect is beyond doubt. Their new-found time they have employed in such a way as to decrease the death rate, and hence obviously the lost time through illness, in their occupations. Every trade-union which pays a death benefit shows from its books a decrease in payments per thousand members since it has had the eight-hour day. In this fact alone the body of the argument for an eight-hour workday, on the score of health, is carried to the point of conviction. Men who are living longer than their predecessors at the same calling are obviously living better in all the implications of the word. They and their families are housed better, dressed better, fed better, educated better—in all respects, as a whole, are happier. This truth is to be seen in so many industries and communities, it is a truth that so appeals to common sense and ordinary observation, as well as to the conviction developed in us with experience that man tends to elevate himself with opportunity, that to attempt to prove it by statistics and recapitulations of the inquiry were to misapply man's discriminating faculty.

In proposing an eight-hour day the first question to be settled is economic. It is whether the total output will warrant the possible lessening of effective toil. In other words, can society sustain itself and progress on eight hours' work? To this query the industrial wageworkers reply, "There has been no diminution of output by reason of the reduction of hours of labor from 10 to 8. In not a few occupations the output has not varied from the results of 10 hours, the number of human workers remaining the same in proportion. Workers, with the aid of new machinery, within the period of the present generation have in nearly all occupations vastly increased product. Besides, the cessation of the two hours' work in his vocation has given the worker opportunity to add to his product in his avocations. His leisure hours, it may be said without paradox, have given him the time, opportunity, and pleasure of caring for his house, his garden, and his side ventures. The eight-hour day has given more, not less, of material things to the world. A whole continent, as is the case of Australia, may have the eight-hour day and mankind be the richer.

It is clear that the eight-hour day is not only a boon to the men, women, and children who toil—to humanity—but that through it, when it shall have become general, the present total production of society will be increased.

The foremost demand of the organized-labor movement is for a shorter workday. It is in the interest of labor; it must necessarily be in the interest of progress. The eight-hour day is the harbinger of more successful industry and commerce, its tendency is upward, and it will surely help to solve the greatest of all the material problems of our lives on a peaceful and permanent plane.

Mr. MANN. I do not wish to ask the gentleman any question. I ask unanimous consent that the author of this bill, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. WILSON], who is unavoidably detained, may have leave to extend remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] requests that his colleague [Mr. WILSON] be given unanimous consent to print remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] asks unanimous consent to print remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I make the same request for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the same request for himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is a bill relating to limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics. It is an eight-hour bill. I have a very decided opinion in regard to matters of hours of labor. It was my good fortune—as I look back on it now I consider it good fortune—that in my youth and early manhood I engaged in quite a variety of employments in which, for a considerable number of years, I did the hardest sort of manual labor.

I was possessed of a good constitution, blessed with good health, and with that power of recuperation which a kind Providence gives to us in our youth. Yet I well remember many a day when the closing hours of the forenoon and the closing hours of the afternoon brought me to a state where it was almost impossible for me to do good and effective work, to give that energy, care, and attention to my work which was required to be faithful and efficient in the labor in which I was employed. I know of no subject, economic, sociological, humanitarian—for it is all of these—in regard to which public opinion has changed so rapidly in the last 10 or 15 years as it has with regard to the hours of employment. A short time ago I talked with a gentleman in whose employ many years ago I, with fair efficiency, I think—and I take some pride in that—polished the head of a drill with an 8-pound hammer in the deep and wintry recesses of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison, in Colorado. When I knew him, himself sprung from the ranks of labor, big, strong, vigorous, active, forceful, he found it hard to believe that any man had done his duty until he worked at least 10 hours. Talking with him recently he said:

> On some Government work on which I employed many hundreds of men recently I was required to comply with the 8-hour law. It was a new experience to me. I undertook it with some misgivings and with considerable regret. I am glad I had that experience. I never had so satisfactory work done in all my experience. I never did a piece of work surrounded with as many difficulties which I executed and completed as satisfactorily as I did that piece of work, and, strange to say, while I paid my men for 8 hours practically what I would have paid them for 10 hours the cost was, in my opinion, and based on experience of many years, but little, if any, more than it would have been under the 10-hour day.

Mr. Chairman, those of you who have labored at good, hard, physical labor will understand what this means. Let us take, for instance, any work requiring the expenditure of the maximum of physical effort, or work requiring close, constant, straining attention. When a man has done that sort of thing for 10 hours he must be a remarkable man if he is in condition for the next day's work. He will do nearly as much in 8 hours, and he will do it better and much more cheerfully than in 10 hours. So that, from the standpoint of industry, my opinion is that we shall in the long run profit in quality and, in many cases, in quantity of work if we adopt 8 hours in most lines of employment. There are some lines of employment in which it will be difficult, perhaps impossible, to reduce the hours of labor to 8 without considerable readjustment of business, but where it can be done the movement toward the shorter day should be encouraged. Looking at it from the higher standpoint of humanity, it gives the man who works with his hands some time, other than the hours that he should have for rest and refreshment, for recreation and improvement. Remember, there are many men who have gotten what little education they have been able to pick up largely in the odd hours before and after the day's work, and that will be true even under the more generally favorable conditions for acquiring an education which prevail to-day. We are approaching the time when, in my opinion, there will be but little objection on the part of anyone to the general adoption of the shorter day, in the interest of industry and in the interest of humanity.

But, Mr. Chairman, I understand there is but little opposition to the general purposes of this bill, and therefore no necessity for arguing the question at length. I propose to crave the indulgence of the House for a short time to discuss some matters which are in a way pertinent to a bill to limit the hours of labor, for they relate to subjects in regard to which certain gentlemen have been working overtime. It has not been an 8-hour proposition at all. It has covered, in the main, 24 hours a day and 7 days in the week—a work, in my opinion, which the gentlemen themselves, those who have been most busily engaged in it, will, when they have time to reflect, and in the cold, gray dawn of the morning after the 5th of November, feel was a work entirely without warrant or justification. I refer to some things that have been said, charges that have been made, relative to the right of certain delegates to seats in the national Republican convention recently held at Chicago.

Before, during, and since the meeting of the Republican national convention at Chicago, Col. Roosevelt and some of his supporters have repeatedly and in the most violent and intemperate language made the most serious charges of fraud and wrongdoing in connection with the election and seating of a large number of delegates to the convention. The gravity of these charges, the vehemence with which they have been uttered, and the persistency with which they have been reiterated, coming as it has in a period of unrest and suspicion, have profoundly influenced many good people.

The faith a large number of people have in some of those who gave utterance to or repeated these charges had much to do with disposing many people to accept them as gospel. Few people realize how men may, in the first instance, be misled by overzealous or unscrupulous subordinates or supporters, or by the statements of those claiming to be informed as to facts, and how difficult it is for even the best of men to admit an error after proclaiming it, particularly if it serves an all-controlling ambition.

American political history has furnished sufficient examples of the extremes to which men will go in making unmerited charges under the spur of political ambition or from the sting of political disappointment to make our people cautious in accepting as the truth sensational charges prompted by such influences.

It should be remembered that the Republican Party, with its marvelous and glorious history of achievement in the cause of liberty, righteousness, and good government, has, at various times in its history, been the victim of the most extreme, vindictive, and abusive assaults from within its own ranks, and that its leaders who are to-day most revered were in the days of their activity and usefulness most villianously reviled and denounced.

Nothing in history is more astounding to the student of to-day than the abuse heaped upon Lincoln and the charges made against him, as representative of his party, by men within the party when he was a candidate for reelection. Many here can recall the measureless and vitriolic vehemence of the assaults on the honesty and integrity of the party and its leaders by men calling themselves Republicans during the Liberal Republican movement in 1872 and the free-silver bolt in 1896, and at other times.

Unfortunately people who ought to be warned by having been misled at other times by mere violence of assertion and vehemence of denunciation seem to have short memories with regard to such matters. Furthermore, we have a new generation of voters who, inexperienced in politics and being of honest and conscientious intent and purpose, are inclined to accept charges made with fine simulation of sincerity as evidence, and vehement reiteration in frenzied imitation of outraged virtue as conclusive proof.

The truth is ever at a temporary disadvantage in the presence of persistent prevarication, loudly and violently proclaimed. Those who would profit by charging others with wrongdoing in matters political invariably consider it necessary to employ the language of extravagance, sensation, and abuse to challenge and fix public attention while, he who tells the simple truth finds neither warrant nor excuse for more than the plain, unvarnished, unsensational tale. To reply in kind to abuse and vituperation is but to cheapen the quality of truth.

NOT AGAINST INDIVIDUALS BUT THE PARTY.

It should be remembered that the charges made against the manner of seating the delegates at Chicago are not charges against any individual or set of individuals, but against a great party as represented at the only Nation-wide gathering of the party. Men and parties do not become corrupt overnight. A party that will do a great wrong to-day could not have been honest yesterday, last year, or four years ago, *and yet a majority of the majority of the national committee which decided these cases were members of the committee four years ago, when Mr. Roosevelt was pleased with and indorsed the committee's work.* In the convention among the majority were many who had been *personal and political friends of Mr.*

Roosevelt when he was President and had enjoyed his confidence. Had the character of all these men changed?

It had not been my purpose to make any statement in the House or elsewhere in regard to these cases. My mind and conscience have been so clear about them that I have felt discussion was almost superfluous. I have been reminded, however, that as the only present Member of the House *who was a member of the committee on credentials* I owed it to my colleagues to at least briefly review the more generally discussed cases.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] served on the national committee during the hearings of the contest cases, and I am glad to know that he contemplates discussing them. Our friend and late colleague, Mr. MALBY, served faithfully in the committee on credentials, including the wearisome all-night session. I sat near him, and noticing his appearance of fatigue begged him to retire. Consciencious and honorable gentleman that he was, he refused to do so, saying he preferred to hear the argument and evidence in every case. I fear that the strain of these long, trying sessions shortened our friend's days; if so, he was a martyr to duty.

IMPORTANT TRUTH BE KNOWN.

There are reasons why the truth in regard to these contests should be known, why the reckless statements with regard to them should be refuted of far greater and more far-reaching importance than any question of the effect these statements and charges will have upon the fortunes of any party or candidates in the coming election. This great Republic of ours, the greatest and most successful experiment in free government the world has ever known, is a Government of parties. The very continuation of our Government depends not only upon the honesty and integrity of the people in the management *of great party* organizations and otherwise, but in the continued confidence of the people in such honesty and integrity.

THE CHANGE IS IN ROOSEVELT.

If the organization of a great party which has been a leader in great moral and political movements can become so corrupted between presidential campaigns as to commit such political crimes as it is charged were committed in Chicago the party is not only in a bad way but the country is beyond redemption. If a party of which Mr. Roosevelt had the support and an organization which four years ago he trusted—and some say controlled—could in so brief a time become so lost to all sense of decency, what hope is there for a new party which he might create? The members of the national committee, whose action at Chicago Mr. Roosevelt denounces in such intemperate terms, were four years ago, in Mr. Roosevelt's estimation, entirely fair-minded, intelligent, and honorable gentlemen. Is it probable that they all fell from that high estate in so short a time? Is it unreasonable to suggest that perhaps the change is in Mr. Roosevelt and not in the national committee and the membership of the convention?

APPROPRIATING ELECTORS.

The claim that Col. Roosevelt was denied the nomination at Chicago through the larceny of delegates is not only expected to contribute directly to the third-party movement, but it is expected to contribute even more potently indirectly by furnishing the excuse for the most impudent and revolutionary plan of political larceny ever conceived. It is proposed to appropriate the livery and secure the benefits of Republican State organizations, while at the same time repudiating the party and candidates. It is difficult to conceive a more shameless proposal of pure piracy than this.

PENNSYLVANIA.

In Pennsylvania, for instance, about a third of the Republicans of the State expressed a preference for Mr. Roosevelt for President. He was not nominated, but the men who were temporarily placed in command of the Republican ship by a third of the Republican voters are expected, I am told, to continue to fly the Republican flag at the masthead and secure whatever benefits can be thus obtained with the expectation of eventually, whatever happens, scuttling the ship after having gotten away with the cargo.

The local boss of the new crew, being a more cautious pirate than some others, has suggested that while he hopes and expects to turn the cargo secured under the Republican emblem over to the enemy, he thinks, in decency, he ought to hold out some hope to Republicans that, if they prove to be the majority of the crew, they may secure the benefits of the cargo obtained under their flag. But the chief, under whose orders he seems to be operating, repudiates any such mushy procedure; if you are to be a pirate, be a pirate, quoth he; carry their flag as long as it is to your interest to do so, but eventually make them walk the plank and scuttle the ship.

The Democrats of my native State of Missouri, by a large and enthusiastic majority, expressed their preference first, last, and all the time as a candidate for the Presidency for their beloved fellow citizen, the honored and respected Speaker of this House. He had a majority of the delegates in the Democratic national convention; a majority of the delegates in that convention voted for him on roll call nine different and distinct times. By all reasonable and proper rules he was the candidate of the convention. In the moment of his triumph the great prize was ruthlessly snatched from him without warrant, justification, or excuse. Why are not the Democrats in Missouri proposing to have the Democratic electors in that State vote for CHAMP CLARK?

If there are any electors anywhere who have any sort of a justification for being traitors to the binding and sacred obligation which rests upon an elector to vote for the candidate of the party that placed him in nomination, they are the Democratic electors in Missouri. I assume, however, that they, like the man they honored with their votes, are honest citizens, and therefore no such thought has entered their minds. They have probably realized, if they have even thought of it, how clearly traitorous would be the act suggested, how destructive of our plan of electing Presidents. What excuse and opportunity would be offered for the most outrageous scandals in the case of a close vote in the electoral college if electors are held to be free to vote as their fancy or interests dictates. We have so far heard these shameless proposals only from men who hope to profit by overturning the legal machinery of our Government. I am not prepared to believe that the men who have received party nominations as electors are so recreant to their solemn obligations as to commit such acts of perfidy or that the people generally would tolerate them.

COMMITTEE ON CREDENTIALS.

I accepted service on the committee with reluctance, upon the insistence of my colleagues, because I realized the hard work that would be required and the inevitable criticism from one side or the other that was sure to follow. At that time my only knowledge of the facts with regard to the contested cases had been obtained from reading the daily papers, many of them reflecting the view of the cases taken by extreme Roosevelt adherents. So far as I had any definite opinion with regard to the cases which it would require evidence to remove, it was in favor of the Roosevelt delegates in certain cases to which I shall refer hereafter.

The committee on credentials of the Republican national convention was in session in all aproximately 40 hours, equivalent to five 8-hour days. In order to prepare cases for consideration of the convention it held one continuous session of nearly 30 hours. Every contestant who appeared was given a hearing. *Ample time was given for the presentation of cases, in one case over three hours being devoted, at the request of the Roosevelt contestants, to a case which had been unanimously decided in favor of the Taft delegates by the national committee.* No man can honestly say, and I think no contestant has said, or will say, that he was not given a fair, extended, and courteous hearing by the committee on credentials. I think that statement also applies to the hearings before the national committee, which heard contest cases for 15 days.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Were not those hearings public?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; both before the national committee and the committee on credentials were public.

Mr. HILL. And that for the first time in the history of the party?

Mr. MONDELL. For the first time in the history of any political party, as far as I know. The four great newspaper associations of the country were represented at all of those hearings, and their men were there all of the time and took notes of what was done and said, so that there was nothing said by anyone in connection with any of these contests that was not heard by the newspaper correspondents.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I understand the gentleman to say that he attended the sessions of the committee on credentials quite continuously. The member of the committee from my State, Mr. S. X. Way, is a gentleman I know very well. I intend to get his opinion on these several contests, assuming that he was present at the hearings. Does the gentleman know whether he was present or not?

Mr. MONDELL. I was present at all of the hearings, except for a short time on the Texas cases. It is impossible for me to

say, of course, just how continuously all of the other gentlemen attended. When our committee first met, and before we had transacted any business or adopted rules, the member from California, after talking threateningly and excitedly for a few moments, dramatically shouted, "Follow me to the Florentine room," which room was, I understand, Col. Roosevelt's headquarters. Whereupon there was a somewhat ridiculous scramble on the part of certain gentlemen to see who could get out of the room first. My recollection is that the member on the committee from South Dakota was one of the bolters. At varying intervals they more or less shamefacedly returned, or, rather, as we understood it, were ordered back by the Roosevelt bosses, with the suggestion they better not bolt until they had some excuse for so doing. I don't know just when the member on the committee from South Dakota slid back—I do not want to do him an injustice—but I am very much mistaken if he heard most of the contests. *Some of those who have been loudest in their denunciation of what was done heard but very little of the testimony or arguments before our committee. That is particularly true of the members from California and Illinois.*

NUMBER OF CONTESTS.

There were contests filed before the national committee involving the seats of 252 out of 1,078 delegates in the convention. Of these, 238 were brought by Roosevelt contestants against Taft delegates. Some of these contests were so utterly frivolous that they were not even urged before the national committee when it met for the purpose of making up the temporary roll for the convention. The committee was in session 15 days, and *a large majority of contests which were heard by the national committee were decided by that committee by unanimous, or practically unanimous, vote,* and in the cases where there was a difference of opinion the vote in favor of the delegates who were seated constituted in most of the cases a majority of two-thirds or over.

After the national committee had made up the temporary roll of the convention, Mr. Roosevelt's managers made up a list of cases to be presented to the committee on credentials of the convention, involving the title to 128 seats, thus surrendering all claims to 110 of the seats which had been originally contested. That even this list of 128 was padded by cases known to have no merit is evidenced by the fact that the contests which were actually presented for the consideration of the committee on credentials involved but 92 seats, some of which were seats which the national committee had unanimously given to Taft delegates. *The fact is, therefore, that of the 238 contests originally brought by the Roosevelt people but 92 were taken before the body whose duty it was to finally determine who were entitled to seats in the convention. The Roosevelt people had abandoned 146 of their contests before reaching the convention or its credentials committee.*

FRIVOLOUS CHARACTER OF CONTESTS.

Before taking up the questions involved in the remaining cases it might be interesting and profitable to inquire into the nature and the character of most of the contests brought on behalf of Mr. Roosevelt and the way in which they were brought. Of course, it does not prove anything for me to say that the overwhelming majority were of the most frivolous character; that they were brought deliberately for the purpose of confusing the issue, misleading the public, and laying the foundation for the outrageous charges which followed. As my mere statement of belief is not evidence, I should not express that opinion if it were not fully justified and substantiated by facts that are not questioned and *by the admission of Roosevelt supporters.*

In many of the cases from the Southern States, notably Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, almost complete sets of Roosevelt contesting delegates were named at alleged conventions, in no way worthy of the name, held from two to three months after the Taft delegates had been regularly elected. It is notorious that the holding of these "conventions" and the naming of these delegates was due to the activity of a certain astute gentleman from the North operating in the interest of Mr. Roosevelt, and said to have been liberal in expenditure.

MR. MUNSEY'S TESTIMONY.

We have some very illuminating testimony from a very high Roosevelt source as to the reasons for bringing these contests. I need not remind gentlemen how very enthusiastic Mr. Frank A. Munsey has been in his support of Mr. Roosevelt. In the literary and journalistic world Mr. Munsey has been by all odds the most enthusiastic and emphatic supporter of the ex-President. His paper, the Washington Times, published in this city, and his magazines have devoted their energies for months to further the cause of Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Judson C. Welliver is the trusted political writer on the Times who was given a free hand to boost first the Roosevelt candidacy and now the Roosevelt third party. Mr. Welliver went to Chicago to watch the contest proceedings before the national committee. He saw that body, upon which there were a considerable number of ardent Roosevelt supporters, cast into the discard by unanimous vote one after another of the trumped-up, fictitious, fraudulent contests, and it occurred to Mr. Welliver, and no doubt to Mr. Munsey, that it was necessary to revive the drooping spirits of the Roosevelt adherents, who had been fooled and misled by the bringing of these contests. It appeared to *be necessary to tell some truths,* and Mr. Welliver proceeded to do so in a dispatch from Chicago, published in the Washington Times of Sunday evening, June 9, which is in part as follows:

ROOSEVELT FORCES REGAIN CONFIDENCE DESPITE COMMITTEE'S WORK—CONTESTS UNABLE TO CHANGE RESULT—ARRIVAL OF WILLIAM FLINN STRIKES TERROR INTO HEARTS OF ADMINISTRATION MEN.

(By Judson C. Welliver.)

CHICAGO, *June 9.*

Seventy-two contested seats in the convention have been passed on by the Republican national committee and every one has been given to the Taft claimants. That sounds as if Taft was making a tremendous inroad on Roosevelt strength; but the fact is that it has little significance.

In order that the reading public, getting its impressions from the daily reports of repeated determinations in Taft's favor, may not misunderstand just what is happening, it is necessary to go back to the beginning of this campaign and explain some things.

When the national committee met in Washington last December there were persistent rumors that Roosevelt might be a candidate. La Follette was already in the field.

GOT AN EARLY START.

The Taft people knew their weakness, and were scared about the situation. They adopted the plan of holding conventions in the South early, because there they had the machinery and could rush matters through with the strong-arm procedure and stow away a fine bunch of delegates, while the Roosevelt movement was still unorganized; indeed, before Roosevelt could be announced.

This they did, and on the day when Roosevelt formally announced that he was a candidate, something over a hundred delegates had actually been selected. When Senator DIXON took charge of the campaign, a tabulated showing of delegates selected to date would have looked hopelessly one sided. Moreover, a number of Southern States had called their conventions for early dates and there was no chance to develop the real Roosevelt strength in the great Northern States till later.

For psychological effect, as a move in practical politics, it was necessary for the Roosevelt people to start contests on these early Taft selections in order that a tabulation of delegate strength could be put out that would show Roosevelt holding a good hand in the game. A table showing "Taft, 150; Roosevelt, 19; contested, 0," would not be very much calculated to inspire confidence. Whereas one showing "Taft, 23; Roosevelt, 19; contested, 127," looked very different.

WHY THEY WERE STARTED.

That is the whole story of the larger number of Southern contests that were started early in the game. It was never expected that they would be taken very seriously; they served a useful purpose, and now the national committee is deciding them in favor of Taft; in most cases, without real division.

CONTESTS TOO RAW.

The southern contests were too raw for the stomachs of even the most prejudiced Roosevelt supporters. It must have been galling to have to admit that these contests were simply gotten up to fool the people, to bring in the wavering brethren, who when in doubt resolve it in favor of the most promising band wagon, by making them believe that Roosevelt had many more delegates than he really had. I do not now recall a more humiliating confession of an attempt to fool the people.

The Chicago Tribune, vigorously supporting Col. Roosevelt, on June 8, after referring to the decision of the national committee in the Alabama cases, gave the *comment of Col. Roosevelt* on the cases as follows:

The colonel showed the reporters a table of delegates he expected to be awarded on the Alabama list. It was shown that he had conceded 22 to President Taft and claimed only 2 for himself.

"You see, I hadn't counted on anything except that one district," he said.

And yet in the colonel's interest all the Alabama delegates had been contested, and all were claimed for him by his managers.

But to return to Mr. Welliver's article. After admitting and conceding the fraudulent and *psychological* character of most of the contests, having abandoned the first line of defense and admitted it was mounted with straw guns, a new position was taken behind cases now claimed to be valid with all the positiveness with which all the cases had formerly been defended. He said:

The ninth Alabama was an exception. There is every reason to believe that Roosevelt was entitled to those two delegates. He was robbed of them, just as he is to be robbed of the Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, and Missouri delegates that he ought to get and just as he will be robbed of the Washington State delegation if the Taft people are convinced that they must do it to save themselves.

The point is that these contests never were listed as available assets of the Roosevelt campaign. It rested on no such flimsy foundation.

We are here solemnly assured that the ninth Alabama is "an exception." It is, in the sense that it is an exceptionally weak case. In the case of the Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, and Washington delegations we are assured an awful robbery was to be committed. How unfortunate it was and is that these champions of Col. Roosevelt could not have looked

forward and have known *that, in the Indiana case, all of Col. Roosevelt's friends and supporters were to vote with the other members of the committee to seat the Taft delegates; that in the case of the Missouri delegates at large they were to be given with equal unanimity to Col. Roosevelt. As to the Michigan delegates at large, they were given to Taft without a roll call; and in the case of the Kentucky delegates at large, but 11 members of the committee of 52 found it in their hearts to vote for the Roosevelt delegates.*

DISFRANCHISING DEMAND.

The impudent demand made by those responsible for faked and flimsy contests, that no delegate whose seat was brought in question by such contests should vote on any question, was a case of adding insult to injury. It was a demand that those who brought the contests—they afterwards admitted were mostly without merit—should benefit by their own wrongdoing to the extent of controlling the convention, steal the ship after having, as sailors under the same flag, disabled the majority of the crew.

Such a rule would allow the most insignificant minority to control a convention by the simple process of bringing trumped-up, eleventh-hour contests against the majority, thus disqualifying them from participating in the convention. This is exactly what the Roosevelt people tried to do in Chicago.

This extraordinary demand was based on the preposterous assumption that the bringing of a fake contest against a delegate rendered him incapable of honestly deciding contests involving others or other questions coming before the convention. To deny a vote to such delegates would leave the convention in control of those who were instrumental in fraudulently bringing their seats into question, on the theory, no doubt, that one who has laid the preliminary plans for a larceny is in a better frame of mind to do justice than his victim.

Reduced to few words, what was proposed was that, having given notice of contemplated wholesale theft, all the proposed victims were to be disarmed to allow the easy and expeditious perpetration of the outrage.

Parliamentary law denies one whose right to a seat is challenged the privilege of voting on the question. The rule was strictly observed in the Chicago convention. No one voted on their own contest.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It is the law in my State.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from South Dakota calls my attention to the fact that the rule is the law in his State. It is a parliamentary rule everywhere, and it is very proper that it should have the sanction of statute.

MOTION TO PURGE THE ROLL.

After the Republican convention had temporarily organized it was proposed by a motion to "purge," as was stated, the convention roll of Taft delegates claimed to be wrongfully placed on the temporary roll and seat Roosevelt delegates in their stead.

Ninety-two seats were named, but this included 18 delegates from Virginia and 2 from the District of Columbia, where contests were so frivolous that they were entirely abandoned, leaving 72 seats as the number which it is understood Col. Roosevelt and some of his supporters now refer to as the "stolen seats." The list is as follows:

Ninth Alabama	2
Arizona	6
Fifth Arkansas	2
Fourth California	2
Thirteenth Indiana	2
Seventh Kentucky	2
Eighth Kentucky	2
Eleventh Kentucky	2
Michigan	6
Third Oklahoma	2
Second Tennessee	2
Ninth Tennessee	2
Texas	8
First, second, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, and fourteenth Texas	18
Washington	8
First, second, and third Washington	6
Total	72

It might be pertinent to inquire by what peculiar and extraordinary power of perfect discrimination the Roosevelt people are able to now differentiate these cases from the 146 other contested cases which they brought and in whose defense they were individually or collectively at one time as vehement as they now are in regard to these cases. By what peculiar virtue does one man, by his insistence upon his followers become the sole judge and arbiter of rights to seats in the national Republican convention? What has happened to a number of cases with regard to which Mr. Roosevelt and some of his followers have been most violent but which are not contained in this list of alleged stolen seats? If I recollect rightly, Col. Roosevelt's earliest and one of his most vitriolic and abusive outbursts with regard to delegates had reference to delegates at large from Indiana. No supporter of his on the national committee voted to seat the contesting Roosevelt delegation. They are not mentioned in this list of delegates that must be unseated in order to "purge the roll."

As the Roosevelt people entirely abandoned their claim as to 146 of the seats they had contested, and their charges of late have been directed toward the contests involving the 72 seats I have referred to, it is not necessary to go into detail as to the abandoned contests, and we may confine ourselves to a somewhat detailed examination of the 72 seats which are the basis of the wholly unwarranted and unjustifiable indictment of a great party and its representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed to the conclusion of his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman how long it would take to conclude his remarks?

Mr. MONDELL. About an hour. I will not take longer than an hour.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] desires to talk in answer to the gentleman from Wyoming. I do not want the extension of time to preclude his answer.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Washington will not object to this extension of time. I do not think it will interfere with me at all. I want the gentleman to have all of the time that he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman will proceed for one hour.

NINTH ALABAMA.

In regard to this case, I had received impressions favorably to the Roosevelt delegates from a conversation had with a colleague in the House, before leaving for the convention, and on the basis of the statement which this colleague made to me, believing it to be true, I felt that the Roosevelt delegates had a good case. How much mistaken I was in that impression a statement of the facts in the case will make very clear.

The case involving the two delegates from the ninth Alabama congressional district is somewhat perculiar in this: That if every claim made on behalf of the two Roosevelt delegates is admitted, still, in view of the undisputed facts, the Taft delegates are clearly entitled to seats in the convention.

In this district there is a district committee of 30 members. When the committee met February 15 for the purpose of arranging for a district convention to elect two delegates to Chicago the chairman was absent; without him 15 was a quorum of the committee. On the committee being called to order by the secretary a dispute arose as to the rights of certain persons to serve as members of the committee; and, unable to agree, the committee divided and two meetings were held in the same hall. There is conflicting testimony as to which faction had the majority of the committee; there is no question, however, but what the Birch, or the Taft, crowd had the larger number of members whose right to serve was not questioned, to wit, 13. The right of two men on the Birch side to serve on the committee is called in question, namely, William Latham and Harvey Hardin. As for Latham, it was claimed that not he but his brother James was a member of the committee. In my opinion there is no doubt but what William Latham was the Latham who was a member.

As for Hardin, who was beyond doubt a member of the committee, a few days prior to the meeting he had handed a man not a member of the committee his resignation, with the understanding it was to be returned to him if he was able to attend the meeting. He appeared at Birmingham the night before the meeting of the committee and demanded his resignation returned to him. This was refused. If Latham and Hardin were members of the committee qualified to act, there is no doubt but what the Taft people had a majority of at least one. On the other hand, to admit the Roosevelt claim to a majority of the committee we must disregard the evidence to the effect that Latham and Hardin were lawful members and at the same time admit the authority of the chairman to fill four or five vacancies without referring the matter to the committee, including the vacancy alleged to exist on account of Hardin's resignation. The right of the chairman to fill such vacancies was sharply challenged by the other side.

To me the evidence was conclusive that the Birch, or Taft, people had a majority of the committee. Even admitting, for the sake of argument, that the wrong Latham was present, the

absence of anyone in the place of Latham left a committee of 28 and as many Taft as Roosevelt men if the chairman's appointees were recognized.

The fact is, however, that had the Roosevelt men a majority of the committee the subsequent procedure deprived them of any claim for their delegates. There are four counties in the district with regular organizations. The only real office of the district committee was to start in motion the machinery in the counties to select delegates to the district convention. If there had been no quorum at all at the district committee meeting, if but one man had issued the call and it were heeded by the county committees by appropriate action, the resulting nominations would have been valid.

What did happen was that the Republican organizations in all four counties obeyed the call of the Birch, or Taft, committee and held delegate conventions in two and mass conventions in two of the counties, at all of which delegates were elected to the district convention and at the same time to the State convention, which in turn elected the delegates at large, which were seated unanimously by the national committee at Chicago. In due course a district convention was held at which regularly elected delegates from all the counties were present unchallenged. This convention proceeded to elect the Taft delegates, which were seated.

On the other hand, no attention was paid by the county organizations to the call issued by the Hadley, or Roosevelt, faction. In three of the four counties no attempt was made to hold conventions.

A Roosevelt State convention was held in Birmingham, in Jefferson County, May 11, over two months after the convention which elected the Taft delegates. At the same time and place it is claimed that a mass convention was held under the Hadley call for a district convention, and Roosevelt delegates were elected. The report of the minority of the committee on credentials does not attempt to claim any regularity of action on the part of the Roosevelt men after the split in the committee. They base their claim entirely on the assertion that the Birch call was not regular.

ARIZONA.

Arizona was entitled to six delegates at large in the convention. The contest there arose over an unauthorized soap-box primary held in Maricopa County. While alleged contests were started by the Roosevelt men in some of the other counties, none were regarded seriously by anybody except a contest in Cochise, which was settled by seating both delegations, with a divided vote.

The history of the Arizona case is briefly as follows: The call for the State convention to elect delegates to the national convention was regularly issued May 1. In view of the fact that there was no State primary law for the election of delegates to a national convention the call instructed the county committees to meet on the 15th of May and determine which of various methods should be adopted for the appointment or election of delegates to the State convention to be held June 3. Two counties, Pinal and Graham, decided to hold primaries for the election of delegates, and in Graham County this decision was unanimously agreed to. In Cochise and Yuma Counties the Roosevelt people had a majority of the county committees. They decided to have the delegates appointed by the committees. This plan was followed in the other counties in the State except Maricopa.

The county chairman in Maricopa County was a Roosevelt man, and upon the assembling of the county committee he forthwith and without any preliminaries appointed three Roosevelt men as a committee on credentials. This action was challenged, but nevertheless the committee so appointed proceeded to report in favor of seating three proxies. There was further protest and an appeal from the chair, and while this was going on other proxies were presented on behalf of other members who were not present. After further consideration the same committee which had reported the seating of the three proxies later reported against the seating of any proxies. This sudden change of front, due to the fact that if proxies were recognized the Taft men would have a considerable majority, led to a disagreement which resulted in two committee meetings and two calls, one signed by the chairman for a primary to elect delegates to the State convention, and another by the secretary and a pro tempore chairman for a meeting of the county committee to select delegates to the convention. In this connection it should be remembered that in the Roosevelt counties of Cochise and Yuma the delegates were selected by the county committees, on the ground that there was no law under which a legal primary could be held.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MONDELL. Very briefly, I will say to the gentleman, because my time is brief.

Mr. NORRIS. I will not interrupt the gentleman's remarks without his consent, of course. I know two hours is very short when you have such a burden on your hands. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true the Taft men in the county objected to proxies and if it is not true they had their way and all proxies were eliminated under objection of the Taft men?

Mr. MONDELL. First thanking the gentleman from Nebraska for his entirely gratuitous expression of opinion as to the merits of the case, I would say that I have stated the facts exactly as they are and I will state them again if he desires. I heard the testimony of the chairman of the committee, and I think I know what occurred. I heard both sides tell about it.

Mr. NORRIS. But the gentleman was not down in Arizona when it happened.

Mr. MONDELL. No; but I heard both sides of the case before the committee on credentials. The chairman appointed a committee on credentials. There is nobody denying that. The action was challenged, nobody denies that. They reported in favor of seating three proxies. There is no denial of that. And then the same committee appointed by the Roosevelt chairman reported in favor of seating no proxies, and they so reported, because if they had seated the proxies the Taft men would have had a considerable majority.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MONDELL. If I have the time I have no objection to an interruption. What was the question which the gentleman desires to ask?

Mr. NORRIS. I did not understand the gentleman, I ask his pardon.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that in this State call in Arizona the county committees had the right under the call to elect the delegates either by the committee, in which case the call fixed the date when it must be done; whether they did not have the right to call the primary, or to call an ordinary convention. I desire to ask the gentleman if it is not true those three methods were specifically provided in the State call?

Mr. MONDELL. The State committee provided that the county committees should decide how they should elect their delegates.

Mr. NORRIS. When the county did decide to elect or select the delegates and did it in the way the State committee designated, there is no question of the legality of the delegates selection, is there? The gentleman is emphasizing the fact that in some counties the Roosevelt committee selected delegates. I want to know whether it was legal or not under the law.

Mr. MONDELL. So far as the county of Maricopa is concerned, the majority of the county committee, either as constituted by the members actually present or as it would have been if the proxies had been recognized, never decided to hold primaries; a minority of the committee so decided. I am one of those old-fashioned people who do not believe in the rule of minorities of committees that do not represent the people.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, if it is brief; but I never will get through if I continue yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the gentleman, that if he says he does not want to be interrupted I will not do it. I would not like to be discourteous.

Mr. MONDELL. And I do not want to be discourteous.

Mr. NORRIS. I concede the gentleman has the right to say he will not yield, but I want to ask the gentleman, which perhaps appears in his printed speech, which I am following here, whether it is not true that in that primary that he claims was not legal or lawful that there was a vote cast within 80 per cent of the highest vote that was ever cast in a Republican primary in that county?

Mr. MONDELL. Nobody on earth, except the gentlemen who hoped to benefit, knows how many votes were cast at that primary. *Arizona has no primary law unless one has been passed since the events related*, so I do not know how any legal primary could ever have been held in the county.

Mr. NORRIS. I can give the gentleman the information, if he would like to have it.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the gentleman may be able to give me the statement of somebody as to how many votes were alleged to have been cast at a soap-box primary, where anybody could have repeated all day long; anybody could have cast a thousand votes at one time, and where the returning officers could have

multiplied the returns a thousand times and not be guilty even of a breach of the peace or a misdemeanor.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman there if it is not true that there never was and never has been any charge brought of any fraudulent vote or anything fraudulent about that primary, except the Taft men claimed that it was illegal—if there is any evidence that there were any fraudulent votes cast there, or that any Democrats voted in that primary?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not recollect that there was much evidence as to the casting of ballots at that primary, if, as a matter of fact, one is justified in referring to such a performance as the casting of ballots. The gentleman asks if there was any charge of fraudulent voting. There could not have been any such thing as fraudulent voting at that primary in the ordinary acceptance of the term. Anybody could have voted—Republican, Democrat, or what not. Anybody could have voted a score of times. Those controlling these misnamed ballot boxes could have made up any returns they saw fit, could have padded them to suit their purpose, and there is no law under which it could have been punished. Probably the Roosevelt people would have considered it in the nature of a good joke. It is very clear that the majority of the county committee and the people in the county who were for Taft believed that anything would be done that it was necessary to do to show a Roosevelt majority. The whole affair was in the hands of the Roosevelt people. No one else was represented. A little later in my speech, if I have time, I want to make some observations to the general subject of soap-box primaries.

Immediately after this call for a primary was issued a majority of the county committee advertised extensively through the newspapers and otherwise, warning Republicans against participating in the primary as it was illegal and irregular. *Practically* no Republicans except those who were for Roosevelt did participate. There were La Follette men who refused to participate, as did the Taft men, there being but 11 Taft votes cast.

The executive committee of the State committee met two days before the State convention for the purpose of hearing all contests and making up a temporary roll, and timely notice was given to all interested parties. There is no doubt but that all had information as to the date and purpose of the meeting. There was only one contest, that from Cochise County, submitted, and both delegations were seated with a divided vote, and thus the temporary roll was made up.

In the assembling of the convention the temporary roll was read, and objection was made by a gentleman whose name was not on the temporary roll, and his objection was overruled. One nomination only was made for temporary chairman, and the person nominated was declared elected and took his place as temporary chairman.

At this stage of the proceedings a number of gentlemen—less than 20—whose names were on the temporary roll and others went to one side or corner of the hall, and according to all accounts the noise and confusion that ensued was terrific. This band of gentlemen, one of whose number had mounted a platform, proceeded amid loud noise and great confusion, during which time whatever was done was largely by pantomime, to hold what they afterwards referred to as a convention at which they alleged they appointed committees on resolutions and credentials, received and accepted their reports, and elected six delegates to the national convention pledged to Roosevelt.

I asked the gentleman who presented the case before our committee how it was possible to make up and receive reports of committees in so brief a time and amid such confusion. *He cheerfully admitted that he believed the reports had been made up beforehand.* The regular convention, with 68 of the 93 votes on the temporary roll, remained in session for over two hours. All business was transacted in an orderly way; committees were appointed and reported. The usual votes were taken, and six Taft delegates were elected.

There never was a cleaner case of a prearranged rump convention than this, and it was made necessary, if any excuse was to be had at all for a contest, by reason of the fact that had there been no temporary roll and only the uncontested delegates allowed to participate in the temporary organization the Taft people would have controlled the convention by a considerable majority.

FIFTH ARKANSAS.

From Arkansas contests were originally filed with the national committee covering the delegates at large and those from the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and seventh districts. The national convention was unanimous in seating the Taft delegates from all but the fifth district, and in that district the vote was 42 to 10. That was the only Arkansas case taken before the committee on credentials, and it was one of the cases in the "roll purging" resolutions.

An enterprising gentleman by the name of Redding is clerk of the Federal court at Little Rock. He was a contesting delegate before the national convention four years ago, but he did not carry his case to the committee on credentials, after an adverse decision by the national committee. Mr. Redding, while repudiated, was not discouraged. He claims to have continued an organization in the fifth Arkansas district. True, his organization did not hold any meetings in the interim, did not nominate a candidate for Congress in the last congressional campaign; in fact, Mr. Redding's organization seems to have been in a state of hibernation or suspended animation since his downfall in 1908.

On the other hand, the organization which was recognized in 1908 nominated a candidate for Congress in 1910, kept up an organization, and in due time called a convention to elect a candidate for Congress and delegates to the national convention. This activity seems to have aroused the dormant Redding organization, or Mr. Redding himself, for he seems to have been the whole show. The awakening, however, seems to have been a slow and difficult process, for Mr. Redding gave but three days' notice of the holding of his convention on the same day and in the same town, Little Rock, as the regular convention. Testimony is conflicting as to whether there was a baker's dozen or a score at Mr. Redding's convention, and how many, if any, were Republicans.

The regular convention was well attended. There was but one contest, and both delegations were seated with a divided vote. The proceedings were orderly and in proper form, and the delegates were instructed for Mr. Taft. *The Redding convention was a joke, the contest was a farce, and yet this is one of the cases which is being constantly alluded to as a case of stolen delegates.*

FOURTH CALIFORNIA.

The fourth California case was not heard before the committee on credentials. When the case was reached in alphabetical order, neither the Roosevelt delegates nor their attorneys could be found, whereupon a messenger was dispatched to inform them that the committee would take up the case whenever it suited their convenience. Several hours later a communication signed by the Roosevelt delegates was presented to the committee. This communication was most insulting in character, impugned the motives of the members of the committee, stated that the Roosevelt delegates had no confidence in the committee, and therefore declined to present their case for the committee's consideration. In the absence of the California member of the committee, who had previously bolted, this communication was presented by another member.

The call for the Republican convention provided—

that in no State shall an election be so held as to prevent the delegates from any congressional district and their alternates being selected by the representative electors of the district.

That provision is in accordance with the highly important principle of local self-government. It is founded in justice, equity, and righteousness. Is there a Member within the sound of my voice who questions the wisdom and propriety of that provision.

I will guarantee there is no one who does not believe we ought to insist that the people of a district shall have the right to elect their delegates as they elect their Member of Congress. If there is such, I should like to have him rise and say so. I do not see any gentleman rise.

After that call was issued the Legislature of California, under the influence of the governor, passed a law under which the voters of the entire State voted for all of the district delegates, though the nominations were made by districts.

Under the terms of the call none of the Roosevelt district delegates from California were entitled to seats in the convention. All were seated, however, except the delegates from the fourth district, where the Taft delegates had an undoubted majority of the votes of the district.

The Republican Party may be defeated, and it can stand defeat, but it can not afford to agree to a policy under which the people of a district are virtually disfranchised. *The party can not afford to tolerate practices under which great cities will control delegations from whole States.* I do not believe any party in this country will ever give its assent to the California plan, the plan which gives bosses their desired opportunity to control delegations.

THIRTEENTH INDIANA.

The next case, taking them up alphabetically, in the "purging resolution" is that of the thirteenth Indiana. It stands in a class by itself, and illustrates how men overreach themselves

when they part company with their judgment. I am rather inclined to the opinion that of the delegates elected to the thirteenth Indiana convention a very small majority was at the time the meeting was called to order favorable to Mr. Roosevelt. The test came on the election of a permanent chairman, a Taft man being clearly and legally elected by a very narrow majority. The vote in Laporte County, which was cast for the Taft chairman, was challenged by a delegate from another county on the ground that there were two or more delegates who were instructed for Roosevelt, and therefore intended or were expected to vote for a Roosevelt man for chairman, but on the polling of the delegation the solid vote was again given for the Taft chairman. From Fulton County the Taft chairman received one-half vote more, so it was claimed by outsiders, than the Taft strength in the county, but the delegation stood by its vote.

The election of the Taft chairman seems to have convinced the Roosevelt men that the Taft people had a majority in the convention and they immediately inaugurated the riotous procedure which seems to have been a part of the general plan of the Roosevelt supporters everywhere. When the chairman, following a rule previously adopted, declined to poll a county delegation in regard to the representation of the county on the credentials committee pandemonium broke loose, and the disorder was such that it was difficult to hear the proceedings. The committee on credentials dismissed all contests, of which there were six against Roosevelt delegates and two against Taft delegates. In the midst of fearful din and confusion kept up by Roosevelt people, which lasted several hours, and during which time the chairman used a megaphone, Messrs. Studebaker and Fox, Taft delegates, were declared elected, there being no other nominations made and some of the Roosevelt delegates failing to vote. The result of the vote was not questioned at the time nor for more than a month and a half afterwards.

After the adjournment of the regular convention and as the delegates were leaving the hall, a few delegates gathered under a balcony in a corner of the hall where they remained for not to exceed five minutes. In the meantime the band was playing and the usual confusion attending the adjournment of a meeting was going on. At that time and under those circumstances it was claimed that the contesting delegates were elected. The noise was so great that the probability is that a few of the little handful gathered could hear each other. To call such gathering a convention is ridiculous beyond words.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to yield briefly.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it true that there was a statement presented to your committee, signed by a majority of the members of this convention, stating that they had voted against the election of the Taft delegates?

Mr. MONDELL. No; there were some affidavits to the effect that those signing them had not voted for Taft delegates.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. MONDELL. I said no. That was my answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. NORRIS. The question I wanted particularly to call the gentleman's attention to was when through the megaphone the chairman called for the negative vote on the election of the Taft delegates whether or not there was not a statement presented by ex-Senator Beveridge to your committee signed by a majority of that convention stating that they had voted against that motion?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not recall any such statement. I am quite certain there was none. I think it was conceded there was no considerable vote. Most of the Roosevelt people did not vote. Senator Beveridge did not appear before our committee in regard to the thirteenth Indiana. The gentleman from Nebraska is barking up the wrong tree. He is talking about the wrong contest. Senator Beveridge was before our committee for two long hours in the middle of the night in regard to the Indiana contest at large.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not asked about the Indiana contest at large.

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly, if the gentleman has in mind anything that Beveridge said, it has to do with the delegates at large.

Mr. NORRIS. Did he not appear as attorney for the Roosevelt contestants?

Mr. MONDELL. Not according to my recollection on the thirteenth Indiana. He appeared for the delegates at large, of which he was one. I am amazed that the gentleman from Nebraska will stand here and defend outrageous riots such as that in the thirteenth Indiana. If there ever was a case where men were utterly unjustified and unjustifiable in what they did, that was the one.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman remember how Mr. Cady, the La Follette member on the committee, voted on the thirteenth Indiana case?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; he voted with us on the thirteenth Indiana and referred to it in a report he made to the convention, as follows:

> The Roosevelt delegates created such noise and confusion, lasting for hours, that the transaction of business was impossible. It appears, on the other hand, that the Taft forces were enabled to transact the necessary business and elect their delegates. The opposition to the proceedings, resulting in the election of the Taft delegates, was nothing less than a deliberate attempt to create a state of anarchy, and under the circumstances we do not feel that the Roosevelt delegates were entitled to seats against the Taft delegates.

What the gentleman from Nebraska probably has in mind is a bunch of hazy affidavits which were filed as an afterthought and which had reference to the proceedings that day. There were 143 delegates in the convention. There were 70 of these affidavits couched in the most general terms, and it is impossible for anyone to say whether they have reference to the regular convention or to the little five-minute gathering under the balcony in the midst of noise and confusion and band playing when the Roosevelt delegates were said to have been elected. There were four affidavits signed by men who said that they were favorable to Roosevelt, but in the noise and confusion of the convention they did not vote at all and left before the alleged rump convention. *If the gentleman is relying on these affidavits he loses his case by his own witness.*

I have already stated that I am rather inclined to the opinion that when the convention met there was a small majority—possibly two or three—favorable to Roosevelt, but when the Taft candidate for temporary chairman was elected by a small but unquestioned majority some of the Roosevelt men started a riot, during which some of the Roosevelt men did not vote at all. The major portion of them refused to vote. There was no evidence that any Taft man had anything to do with the noise and confusion. No one claimed anything of the kind, and if the Roosevelt men had kept quiet they would have had abundant opportunity to have displayed their strength, whatever it was. They saw fit, in the words of the gentleman from Wisconsin, to create a state of anarchy.

KENTUCKY.

In Kentucky the policy of "psychological" contests, to which I have heretofore referred, was inaugurated as in other parts of the South. The Taft delegates at large, as well as those from the first, second, fourth, seventh, eighth, and tenth congressional districts were contested. Of these contests only those from the seventh and the eighth were carried to the committee on credentials.

The Republican Party of Kentucky operates under a set of rules adopted long since and uniformly recognized as binding on Republican assemblies and conventions.

SEVENTH KENTUCKY.

The convention in the seventh Kentucky district met in accordance with a regular call, and a temporary roll was made up in accordance with the rule which, in case of a contest, places the delegation on the temporary roll whose credentials are approved by the county chairman.

A Taft man was elected temporary chairman of the convention by a vote of 98 to 47. A committee on credentials, consisting of one member from each county, designated by the delegation, was appointed, and in due course it reported; its report being signed by all of the members of the committee but one who presented a minority report. Not only was the majority report supported by the overwhelming majority of the committee, but it bears every evidence of absolute fairness. The disagreement was particularly over Fayette County. There is abundant evidence that the Taft men were largely in the majority in the mass convention in that county, and that contention is supported by the fact that the chairman, who was favorable to the Roosevelt cause, refused a demand for tellers on the vote for temporary chairman, but proceeded arbitrarily to declare the Roosevelt candidate elected. This arbitrary and revolutionary act on the part of the chairman, which is not disputed, resulted in two conventions in the same hall, one of which elected Taft and the other Roosevelt delegates to the district convention. As I have stated every member of the committee on credentials of that convention except one voted to seat the Taft delegates from that county, and the committee on credentials of the State convention which elected the delegates

at large who were seated also held that the Taft delegates from this county were entitled to their seats.

In the Scott County convention the Roosevelt men bolted the convention after tellers had been appointed to count the vote for temporary chairman, but before the vote was taken. In Franklin County the Roosevelt followers bolted immediately after the unchallenged election of the temporary chairman, and they held their convention in the courthouse yard, if a convention it could be called. The testimony is that there was only a handful of people present. In Woodford County the chairman, a Taft man, refused to grant a count of the votes cast for temporary chairman, and following the rule which was followed in a similar case in Fayette County, where the Roosevelt chairman had refused a count, the Taft delegates from Woodford County were unseated and the Roosevelt delegates seated.

In all the Kentucky district cases the purely technical point was raised that after the call for district conventions had been issued the boundaries of the districts were in some instances changed by a redistricting act. Of course, it was impossible to modify the call after it was issued, and this convention was the flimsiest kind of a technicality.

After the report of the committee on credentials of the district convention, as above stated, was adopted, certain Roosevelt men bolted the convention and held another alleged convention elsewhere, and it was the delegates thus elected that the national committee refused to recognize.

EIGHTH KENTUCKY.

In the eighth Kentucky district there are 10 counties. There were 163 votes in the district convention. There were contests from but two counties. *If both were given to the Roosevelt men, the Taft forces would have had over 100 out of 163 delegates in the convention.* In one of these counties the Roosevelt followers had bolted because the chair appointed tellers when they claimed they wanted them elected. They left before the vote was announced. The Taft delegates were seated in the district convention. In the Boyle County convention the tellers appointed by the chair agreed that the Taft men had a majority, but the chairman refused to accept their statement and certified to the contrary. This delegation was divided and each side given half in the district convention.

After the report of the committee on credentials had been adopted, following the practice which seems to have become a habit with the Roosevelt people, a few of them bolted the convention. One of the flimsy pretexts for so doing was that some of those who participated were from a county not in the new congressional district, though they were in the congressional district at the time the call was issued.

After the regular convention had adjourned a rump convention was held by the Roosevelt men, at which they elected the contesting delegates to the convention. It has never been claimed that this rump convention contained a majority or anything more than a small minority of delegates who had presented any claim of a right to sit in the district convention. The national convention very properly refused to recognize delegates so elected.

ELEVENTH KENTUCKY.

The eleventh Kentucky was a Taft contest. The "purging resolution" claimed that two votes were stolen in that district. As a matter of fact, only one vote was given to Taft by the national committee, the matter having been compromised by seating one each of the Roosevelt and Taft delegates. As a member of the committee on credentials, I heard this case with great interest, for it was a case where the usual procedure was reversed. In this case the Taft delegates instead of the Roosevelt delegates bolted the district convention. It is true they had abundant cause for so doing. The chairman, a Roosevelt man, constituted himself the whole show, and ran things with a high hand, as is evidenced by the fact that 284 delegates out of a total membership of 384 repudiated the proceedings under the chairman and proceeded to elect delegates. If a bolt was ever justified it certainly was on that occasion, but the weary monotony of bolts by Roosevelt men on the flimsiest pretext disinclined me to favor bolts, and in this case I voted to seat both of the Roosevelt men. It was the first case in regard to which there had been a shadow of doubt in my mind. I was anxious to resolve it in favor of the Roosevelt men, but the majority of the committee believed the decision of the vote as agreed upon by the national committee was fair.

MICHIGAN.

The contest involving the six delegates at large from Michigan and the incidents leading up to it furnish capital material for a farce comedy, in which a highly impulsive governor, not so long ago for Taft, at the time of our story for Roosevelt, and now for Wilson, played a star part. A company of the State militia also figures in a picturesque but rather unwilling part. A millionaire ex-member of the Cabinet under Mr. Roosevelt, who had imbibed the spirit of the new nationalism to the point where he considered himself justified in running conventions, if he had a chance, according to his own sweet will, and a State chairman who, after the manner of some other small boys, refused to play unless he could run the game, took prominent serio-comic parts.

To begin with, the State chairman, who was a pronounced Roosevelt man, declined to sanction a call for a meeting of the State committee preliminary to the State convention issued by the secretary and approved by a majority of the committee; he also refused to abide by or approve the action taken, which consisted, among other things, in rescinding the former action of the committee in the selection of a temporary chairman for the forthcoming State convention, the person previously selected having announced his intention to deny roll calls and to decide questions in accordance with his personal preference.

Nobody but the impulsive governor had any notion that there was likely to be disorder at the State convention, nevertheless the local armory, where the convention was to be held, was found on the morning of the convention to be under guard by a detachment of police and militia ordered there by the governor. Difficulty was experienced in securing admission, but a formal demand having been made by the State committee, they were finally admitted only to discover that not only had the governor guarded the doors with his soldiers, but that his political adviser, the chairman of the State committee, had intrenched himself in state on the rostrum, protected by the strong military arm of the State.

The members of the central committee called upon the chairman to call them to order, but he refused to play, and they were obliged to select another chairman for the transaction of business. The soldiers, to their great relief, having been called off, the doors were finally opened, and the delegates and others were admitted, as at national conventions, by card. The chairman of the central committee finally consented to call the meeting to order. The secretary then reminded the chairman that the State committee had selected, as they had the right to do, a temporary chairman. This chairman assumed the chair, and the call for the convention was read. Meanwhile the chairman of the State committee was still attempting to act as temporary chairman of the convention. Among other things, he declared one Baker elected temporary chairman. In order to settle the matter the regularly appointed temporary chairman ordered a roll call on the election of Mr. Baker. There were yeas 67, nays 818.

Pursuing the tactics that have become familiar in connection with these cases, the chairman of the State committee and a few others proceeded to make all the disturbance possible and succeeded very well indeed. *However, the convention went on with its work, committees were appointed and reported, four roll calls were had, with a majority vote of from 900 to 975* in each case and a minority of not to exceed 21 in any case. For a considerable time the State chairman, still claiming to preside, occupied one end of the platform and, with a few others, made all the noise possible. Finally this disturbing element left the hall, taking not to exceed 200 of those claiming seats in the convention of over 1,000. These bolters claim to have elected the contesting Roosevelt delegation.

The committee on credentials of the convention gave abundant opportunity for the hearing of contests, but the contestees from the two counties from which there were contests, Calhoun and Wayne, did not submit their cases. *Had the Roosevelt claimants from those counties presented their cases and been seated the Taft people would still have been in control of the convention by a good majority.* There were troubles in the county conventions in these two counties. In Calhoun County the Roosevelt people created such a disturbance that it was with the greatest difficulty that the convention transacted its business. In Wayne County the Roosevelt manager, who was not a delegate to the convention, and a few others, not to exceed 45, gathered in one part of the hall and created a perfect bedlam by shouting and gesticulating, and finally left the hall. After the row had subsided the convention transacted its business in an orderly way, elected its delegates, and adjourned.

The Taft delegates from Michigan were seated by the national committee without a roll call. The Roosevelt contestants did not take the trouble to include the case in the list of cases to be appealed to the committee on credentials, and yet the Taft delegates from Michigan were among those designated as having been stolen.

THIRD OKLAHOMA.

On the morning of the day fixed for holding the district convention in the third Oklahoma district, a meeting of the con-

gressional committee was held at which each of the 19 counties composing the district were represented by committeemen or proxies. The question of the right of W. S. Cochran to a seat in the committee and to act as chairman, which he proposed to do, was questioned, he having moved from one county into another and both counties claiming other representatives. This, and the fact that the chairman refused to allow the committee to pass upon the question of its own membership, but insisted upon arbitrarily recognizing or refusing to recognize proxies, resulted in a resolution being offered to declare the position vacant. There is no question but what 11 members of the committee who were present in person voted for this resolution. Whereupon Cochran announced the committee adjourned until 1.30 p. m., though according to the terms of the call the convention was to meet at 11. After making this announcement, Cochran and a few others walked out of the committee meeting and the committee continued its business by electing officers, making up a temporary roll, and so forth. At 11 o'clock the convention met in the World Building, the temporary roll was, in due course of business, made the permanent roll, delegates favorable to Mr. Taft were elected, and the records of the convention, including the credentials of all the county delegates, were properly certified by the officers of the county organizations and transmitted to the national convention.

Cochran called a convention at the opera house. This convention had no regular credentials from the counties. Testimony before the national and credentials committees was that this so-called convention had no real organization and was largely made up of idlers and curiosity seekers. This case was so plain that the national committee did not have a roll call, and the testimony before the congressional committee left absolutely no doubt as to the regularity of the Taft delegates.

SECOND TENNESSEE.

The second Tennessee was one of those districts in which it is claimed that the Taft delegates were fraudulently seated. This is the district so ably represented on this floor by Hon. RICHARD W. AUSTIN, who has been twice elected to this House as a Republican. When the district convention met on March 9, there were contests from five counties, two of which had been instituted through a misunderstanding of the facts and were abandoned. When the committee on credentials was appointed the contestants from the other three counties declined to submit their cases to the committee and organized a bolt. The convention proceeded to do business in a regular way and elected two Taft delegates to the Chicago convention, regularly elected Roosevelt delegates from two counties remaining in the convention throughout its entire session. Some bolters also held what, being devoid of a sense of humor, they were pleased to call a "convention." Realizing later that their action was in the nature of a political joke, they resurrected the tattered remnants of an old organization which had been fighting Mr. AUSTIN and making his election as a Republican Congressman difficult. This outfit called another convention, at which only part of the counties in the district were in anywise represented, and elected as Roosevelt delegates to the convention two men who had participated in the election of delegates to the former regular convention. It is very clear to the dullest understanding that the men so elected were not entitled to seats in the Republican national convention.

NINTH TENNESSEE.

The two Taft delegates from the ninth Tennessee district were among those claimed to have been improperly seated, although the Roosevelt delegates and *their attorneys thought so little of their case that they practically abandoned it before the credentials committee.*

There are two organizations in this district, both claiming to be regular, both of whom named congressional candidates two years ago, and each organization held district conventions. At the head of one is the State treasurer elected by a Democratic legislature. The chairman of the organization supported the Democratic candidate for governor in 1910. This organization, on March 26, held a convention at which it elected delegates instructed for Taft. Later, on the theory that 30 days' notice had not been given of the first convention, they held another convention, again without proper notice, and elected and instructed the same delegates for Roosevelt, having in the meantime, possibly owing to the advent of missionaries from the North, changed their minds with regard to the candidate.

The other organization, which had been recognized as regular by the State committee in the election of 1910, and whose candidate for Congress received a considerably larger vote in that year than the candidate of the rival organization, held an orderly convention, after due notice, and elected delegates instructed for Taft, which delegates were seated, as above stated.

TEXAS.

The contest over the eight delegates at large from the State of Texas is the only one heard before the committee on credentials all of which I did not hear. It came after a long night of hearings, and I was absent while a part of the testimony was being taken. The main facts are, however, undisputed. Texas has a primary law under which parties casting over 100,000 votes must act. In 1896 and in 1900 the vote of the Republican Party was large enough to bring it within this law, but under the incubus of the Federal officeholding machine, of which Col. Cecil Lyon has been the head, the Republican vote has steadily dwindled. The Republican vote was 167,000 in 1896, 121,000 in 1900. Roosevelt received but 51,000 votes in 1904. Taft did some better in 1908, with a vote of 65,000, but the Republican candidate for governor of the Lyon officeholders' machine in 1910 received but 26,000 votes. Having manipulated matters in the interest of his officeholding clique so that the Republican vote was too small to require primaries, Col. Lyon was able and did control affairs in a way to deprive the majority of the Republicans of the State of control of the party and place it, or attempt to place it, in his own hands.

Of the 249 counties in the State of Texas there are 9 which did not cast a single Republican vote at the last election and 32 which cast less than 10. The average of the Republican vote in 99 counties was less than 23. *No bona fide primaries or conventions or gatherings of any kind to elect delegates to the State convention were held in any of these counties.* Postmasters friendly to the Lyon machine sent bogus proxies to Lyon and his officeholding henchmen for the purpose of enabling them to control the State convention. The minority of the committee on credentials of the national convention admit in their report that 40 of these counties were not entitled to representatives in the State convention.

When the State committee, dominated by Lyon's Federal officeholders, met for the purpose of making up the temporary roll of the State convention, a Mr. Elgin attempted to keep from the temporary roll these counties in which there had been no regular election of delegates, and though they were temporarily omitted they were finally placed upon the roll. No provision was made whereby contesting delegations could get into the convention hall, and it was made clear that the Lyon machine, through its postmasters' proxies from prairie dog counties, proposed to control the convention to the exclusion of the representatives of the party in counties having Republican organizations and a respectable Republican vote.

In this state of affairs delegates representing more than a majority of all the counties in which there were Republican organizations assembled in convention at Byers's Opera House, in the city of Fort Worth. This convention transacted its business in detail and in an orderly manner in sessions lasting nearly all day, and elected delegates to the national convention pledged to Taft, which delegates were seated by a vote of 35 to 18 by the national committee and by a majority of over two-thirds by the committee on credentials. If one had the time many well-authenticated instances could be recited in which Mr. Lyon, who practically controlled the appointment of 2,800 Federal officials, and those who worked with him deliberately conspired with Democrats to defeat Republican candidates. The sad state of the party in Texas and its dwindling vote is eloquent of the effect of his tactics. His effort to control the party in the State by proxies which represented nobody but possibly a single Federal officeholder is characteristic of the high-handed methods of piracy from which the party has been relieved by action of the national convention.

TEXAS DISTRICTS.

The contests in the second, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, and fourteenth Texas districts were either decided unanimously by the national committee or by a viva voce vote, and *they were abandoned before the committee on credentials.*

In the first district the Roosevelt delegates were elected by a bolting convention which did not represent a tenth of the votes, the bolters being all Federal officeholders.

The Roosevelt delegates from the second congressional district were elected at a meeting of six men held behind locked doors in the mayor's office in the city of Nacogdoches, as stated by an affidavit furnished by the mayor. All of these men had participated in the regular convention which had previously elected the Taft delegates.

FOURTH TEXAS.

In the fourth Texas district the small delegations from four of the five counties were contested. In this district, as in other parts of Texas, the Lyon organization endeavored to prevent negroes from participating. The district convention which elected the Taft delegates constituted a clear majority of the regularly elected delegates.

FIFTH TEXAS.

At the district convention in the fifth Texas district, the chairman, after having unsuccessfully attempted to deprive the counties of their just representation, left the hall. A new chairman was elected, committees were appointed and reported, and Taft delegates were elected to the national convention. Later the Roosevelt men held a meeting at which they elected delegates.

SEVENTH TEXAS.

When the district convention of the seventh Texas met in Galveston, certain persons claiming to be delegates from three unorganized counties insisted upon having their names placed on the temporary roll. As none of the counties had been legally organized, and the parties had no credentials, the committee making up the temporary roll declined to place them thereon, whereupon they organized a rump convention and elected Roosevelt delegates to the national convention.

EIGHTH TEXAS.

In the eighth Texas the Roosevelt people controlled the executive committee, but the Taft people controlled the convention, and adopted a minority report, whereupon the Roosevelt people bolted.

NINTH TEXAS.

In this district the district committee met at the call of a Mr. Speaker, a member of the committee, the chairman having refused to call the committee together to make arrangements for the district convention. At the meeting a letter was read, which stated that the State chairman had concluded that district conventions were not necessary, that the district delegates might be elected at the State convention. The committee did not take this view, and a convention was called for May 15. After this call was issued, the chairman of the district committee changed his mind, and, with a minority of the committee, called a convention on May 18. The convention first called was regularly held, with delegates from 12 of the 15 counties of the district, and elected delegates pledged to Taft. The latter convention was not called in time to give the notice required by law and was slimly attended. It elected Roosevelt delegates.

In the fourteenth Texas district there was a dispute over the control of the executive committee. Certain Federal officials claimed the right to act, which was denied, and the temporary roll of the convention was made up, and as thus made up the Taft men had a considerable majority. There was a contest over Bexar County, the largest county in the district, but it was clear that the Taft delegates were elected by a large majority. The convention elected delegates instructed for Taft by a considerable majority.

WASHINGTON.

The "roll-purging" resolution included the eight delegates at large from the State of Washington and the six delegates from the first, second, and third districts. The contest over the delegates at large hinges primarily on the delegation from Kings County, which includes the city of Seattle. A variety of methods were employed for selecting delegates to the State convention. The first county to act was Ferry, and delegates favoring Roosevelt were selected by the county central committee, as had been the usual practice in the State. Later, in Stevens and Walla Walla Counties, Roosevelt delegates were selected in the same way. From Franklin County a delegation was selected by the county committee instructed for La Follette. In Whatcom and Skaggit Counties Taft delegates were elected as the result of a primary agreed to by all parties. In some counties Taft delegates were selected by county committees.

Mr. WARBURTON. I understood the gentleman to say that it was the usual custom for the county central committee to elect.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is true.

Mr. WARBURTON. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MONDELL. That was the testimony before our committee.

Mr. WARBURTON. That never has been done except in one instance, and that was when we were nominating judges two years ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman from Wyoming ask my colleague from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON] if he is not mistaken when he says that has not been the custom with reference to selecting delegates to a national convention.

Mr. WARBURTON. I am not mistaken on that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. WARBURTON. There was a primary law in force from 1905 to 1909 which prohibited anything of that kind.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON] says there is a State primary law which prohibits it. The people who were upholding his side of the case before the committee swore by the great horn spoon that there was no primary law under which they could elect these delegates, and that was their excuse for having a soap-box primary.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is true, too.

Mr. WARBURTON. The gentleman from Wyoming misunderstood me.

Mr. MONDELL. That was their excuse. They said there was no such law.

Mr. WARBURTON. I did not make any such statement. I say that from 1905 to 1909 what is known as the Hicks primary law was in force, which prohibited the election of delegates in that manner, and in 1909 a primary law was passed which repealed——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. From Franklin County, where the delegation was for LA FOLLETTE, the delegation was selected by the county committee for LA FOLLETTE. In Whitman and Skagit Counties Taft delegates were selected by a primary that everybody agreed to. Being small counties, nobody objected to them, and they were so elected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Briefly.

Mr. NORRIS. That was in the same State where you objected to the primary on account of there being no law to control it?

Mr. MONDELL. I am in favor of legal primaries, and there is no objection to an unofficial primary anywhere where everybody agrees to go into such a primary, but no one should be compelled to go into an unofficial primary.

Mr. NORRIS. Would there be any way to punish a man who voted illegally in that primary? Does not every objection that the gentleman made to Kings County, where there was no primary, apply to this?

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Why not apply the same rule?

Mr. MONDELL. I do apply the same rule, but the gentleman from Nebraska does not. I believe in the rule of the people, and if all the people want an unofficial primary, they have a right to have it. The very fact that all agree to it evidences a state of affairs in which the vote will be honestly cast and counted, but no set of thieves and gangsters have the right to rob the people of their franchise by insisting upon a soap-box primary against the will of the majority. That is my opinion.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. MONDELL. Briefly.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman to complain a little while ago about the epithets "thieves and robbers" being used by the Roosevelt people? Did not the gentleman just a moment ago himself characterize the people of Washington as thieves and scoundrels?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not, as the gentleman well knows, if he was listening, but I am very glad that the gentleman has called my attention to my use of a word I did not intend to use even under just provocation. I apologize to him and to the House for using the word thieves, even in the most general way. I certainly do not want to put myself in the class of those who have been using these epithets, and it was only because of my righteous indignation, as I thought of the outrages on the ballot that were proposed, that the word was wrung from my lips.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I shall be glad to.

Mr. WARBURTON. Does the gentleman agree to the fact that the county central committee of King County——

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I have not reached that, Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman from Washington, I know, is well informed as to the facts, and if he will kindly allow me to make my statement I am sure he can make his in his own time. The gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Nebraska have the advantage of other gentlemen, for they seem to have a copy of my printed manuscript, and therefore know in advance what I am going to say.

Mr. WARBURTON. I understood the gentleman to say that he did not believe in soap-box primaries when ordered by the county central committee.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say anything of the kind. If the county central committee is clearly authorized by the people composing the party to call a primary, and do so, they are within their rights. Minorities on county central committees may do very wicked things, and it was a minority of the legally elected committee in King County which called the primary.

The policy of confusing the situation by contests, which was so characteristic of the Roosevelt people everywhere, was prac-

ticed extensively and apparently with premeditation in this State. A contest was started by the Roosevelt people in a majority of the counties which were carried for Taft, and in this way a majority of the delegates to the convention was contested.

There was the same practice, whether it was in Washington or Alabama or Georgia or Arkansas—muddy the waters, lay the foundations for bolts, mislead the people through "psychological" contests—and if they did not win denounce in the most unbridled language the representatives of a great party, which, under the providence of God, has been one of the immortal instruments in the establishment of liberty, the furtherance of justice, and in the uplift of humanity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has again expired.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have time in which to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent was given for one hour. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON], who has charge of the bill before the House, insisted that he should not take over that time.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the gentleman will allow me to conclude. It will not take over 30 minutes, and I ask for that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to continue for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. In Washington the county committees are composed of precinct committeemen elected at primaries in September of even-numbered years. A majority of the committee so elected in King County appointed a central committee with full power to act for the full committee, and this committee selected the delegates from King County to the State convention and the county committee approved this action. It so happened that the municipal authorities of Seattle had redistricted the city after the election of committeemen in September last and created 131 new precincts. When in April, after the action I have above referred to, the county committee assembled they found present 131 persons who claimed to be members from the new precincts by appointment from the county chairman. The same committee under the same chairman had in a similar case decided that the appointment of such additional members by the chairman was illegal, and it undoubtedly was.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MONDELL. Briefly.

Mr. WARBURTON. Is not that the custom and the practice of the State for the chairman of the county central committee, when a new precinct is divided or a vacancy occurs, to appoint the new committeeman?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if there is any State in the American Union that has any provision of law under which a man holding no official position at all can appoint 131 *elective* officers, that State needs to modify its statutes. Of course, there is no such power granted in any American Commonwealth. These were not vacancies; they were *elective offices* that had never been filled because the time for filling them had not arrived.

Mr. WARBURTON. On the contrary, is it not the ordinary rule everywhere?

Mr. MONDELL. On the contrary, as I have stated, this very committee, under this very same chairman in a former case when the same question had been raised, had held that the chairman had no authority to appoint, and he never questioned that judgment. There is no question about it.

The chairman did attempt to appoint 131 elective officers. Certainly I do not have to argue with the House of Representatives of the American Congress as to whether that kind of thing is warranted by any law anywhere.

It is claimed that the county committee, increased by the presence of these new appointees, ordered a primary for the election of delegates to the State convention, *but a majority of the legally elected members of the committee made affidavit to the effect that they did not authorize the primary.* No attempt was made to hold this primary in accordance with law or with legal safeguards. It was purely a soap-box affair. It was held in conjunction with the Democrats favorable to Wilson and at the same time and places.

The officers—if such they could be called—who were present at the primaries were appointed by the Roosevelt managers in the county and were responsible to no one. No outrage that could have been committed on the ballot would have been punishable. Repeating or stuffing the ballot boxes would not have been even a misdemeanor. Those in charge of the ballot boxes were at liberty to make up such returns as they saw fit. In view of these facts the Taft Republicans were exhorted not to attend the primaries or participate in them in any way, and they did not do so to any extent. There are between seventy and seventy-five thousand Republican voters in King County. At the close of the primaries the local papers announced that about 3,000 votes had been cast. *The tally lists and ballots were not filed with any public official,* and the Taft people never had an opportunity to see the alleged returns until they were filed with the national committee, when it was claimed that 6,900 votes had been cast for Roosevelt and 500 for Taft. In 30 precincts no votes whatever were cast.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. WARBURTON. You do not dare to, because here is the morning paper reporting it by precincts.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the papers may or may not have been accurate.

Mr. WARBURTON. This is by a Taft paper.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Washington insists on interrupting me, I am perfectly willing to call his witness in this case and will accept the witness if he will. I said a moment ago that at the close of the primaries the local papers announced that about 3,000 votes had been cast, but *the tally lists and ballots* were never filed with any public official, and the Taft people never saw the alleged returns until they were filed in the contest with the national committee, at which time it was claimed that about 7,400 votes in all had been cast—6,900 for Roosevelt and 500 for Taft. Now, the gentleman from Washington insists on my accepting the statement of a morning paper published the morning after the primaries, which he says reports the election by precincts.

I happen to be informed with regard to the article which, I understand, the gentleman refers to. It was printed in a pamphlet of the records of proceedings of the Washington State convention filed with the national committee. The paper is the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, and Herman W. Ross, the reporter who furnished the copy, furnished an affidavit to the effect that he received these returns of the gentlemen who were managing the primaries on behalf of Roosevelt, who gave them to him as being correct. The article is quite long and purports to give the votes for Roosevelt and LA FOLLETTE by precincts, but does not give a single vote for Taft in the precinct tabulation. I will accept the gentleman's witness if he insists upon it. The opening statements of this article are as follows:

FACTION PRIMARY IN KING BRINGS OUT SMALL VOTE.

No judges in many precincts and no polling lists to check voters—Some boxes are empty—In the entire county there are cast only 2,810 for Roosevelt and 1,530 for LA FOLLETTE—Wilson Democrats poll 649; CLARK gets 226.

The factional primary held yesterday by the Roosevelt and La Follette Republicans and the Wilson Democrats was notable for the lack of interest displayed by the voters. Every effort had been made to attempt to poll a large vote so as to indicate the popularity of the three presidential candidates in King County.

Complete returns received last night from 214 out of 281 city precincts and 9 of the country precincts showed that from a total of 100,000 voters of King County 2,810 went to the polls to express a choice for Theodore Roosevelt, 1,530 voted for LA FOLLETTE, 649 Democrats voted for Woodrow Wilson; and 226 for CHAMP CLARK.

Although the supporters of William Howard Taft refused to recognize these primaries arranged under the sole supervision of Roosevelt and La Follette leaders as lawful and legal, and in spite of the fact that the King County Taft Club and the King County executive committee had sent out thousands of letters urging Republicans not to participate in these primaries, Mr. Taft received a total vote of more than 400.

It will be noted that the total vote for Roosevelt and LA FOLLETTE, as stated by this article, is 4,300, which is over 3,000 less than the number of votes which it was claimed had been cast when the Roosevelt contestants filed their contest in Chicago.

Mr. WARBURTON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WARBURTON. The gentleman said a moment ago that there were 75,000 Republican votes. I want to call his attention to the fact that at the last election with the full vote—Democrats, Socialists, and everyone in the city of Seattle—there were not 55,000 votes cast.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know anything about that, but I remember very distinctly seeing a registration list by precincts of Seattle alone, made in 1912, totaling more than 74,000 names.

The filing of numerous contests by the Roosevelt people created a condition hitherto unknown in the State of Washington, and to meet it the State committee met in advance of the convention for the purpose of hearing contests and making up a temporary roll. There was a determined effort to intimidate the committee, but it was not successful. The contests, includ-

ing the one from King County, were all heard, and the temporary roll made up by a vote of about three to one.

After the temporary roll had been made up there were rumors that the Roosevelt people proposed to storm the convention hall with their numerous contesting delegations. Failing in that it is clear they intended to hold a rump convention, for they had hired a hall and gathered their forces there. In order to prevent the storming and packing of the convention tickets were issued to delegates and visitors. As soon as the Roosevelt followers found they could not pack the convention they retired to the hall they had previously hired and held a separate convention, at which the contesting Roosevelt delegates were elected.

The regular convention transacted its business with a majority of the duly elected delegates in attendance. The contest from King County was not presented to the committee on credentials. The committee adopted the temporary roll except as to the delegates from two counties, and as thus amended it became the roll of the State convention which elected eight Taft delegates.

The State convention recessed for the purpose of allowing the three district conventions to be held, and Taft delegates were elected from each of the three districts.

As I have stated, the Democrats favorable to Wilson held a soap-box primary in King County in conjunction with the Roosevelt Republicans and at the same time and place. *The Democratic State committee refused to seat the delegates thus named and seated, as the Republicans did, a delegation appointed by the county committee. The Democratic convention at Baltimore took the same action. The action taken by both parties was the same.*

VIRGINIA.

The motion to unseat 92 Taft and seat 92 Roosevelt delegates included all of the delegates from Virginia. As I have stated, all these contests were so utterly frivolous that they were entirely abandoned. The alleged convention at which the contesting delegates were said to have been named were in every case held more than two months after the regular convention. These mushroom conventions sprung from the fertilizing activities of a Roosevelt agent from the North, heretofore referred to. There was only one vote in the national committee in favor of seating these delegates. None of the cases were appealed to the credentials committee. A colored Republican from the fifth district asked for a hearing, but the statements he made related to happenings four years ago. It should be remembered that these *wickedly frivolous contests represented one-fifth of the alleged "stolen" delegations*, and it is on such infinitely and maliciously frivolous contests as these that the most astounding charges of fraud and corruption have been hurled at the convention of a great political party.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Possibly some of those present may have some knowledge of the manner of the election of delegates to the national convention from the District of Columbia. A primary election, agreed to by all parties and participated in freely by Republicans of all factions and surrounded by all possible safeguards, was held. The returns were made to an election board named by the national committee and showed that the Taft delegates received 2,966 and 2,964 votes respectively, as against 1,846 and 1,148 for the Roosevelt delegates. A lot of general charges were filed, none of which were substantiated, while the regularity of the election of the Taft delegates was abundantly proven. *The contest was a mere bluff.* The national committee seated the Taft delegates by a viva voce vote. The case was never carried to the credentials committee, though the contesting Roosevelt delegates were in Chicago at the time. *This is a fair sample of the alleged "theft," which some men are making the basis of an excuse to desert the candidates of their party.*

COMMITTEE ACTION.

The majority of the committee on credentials made written reports to the national convention on every contest submitted to them, giving in detail their reasons for the action taken in every case. Beyond a formal protest, filed with every case, against certain gentlemen, who were members of the national committee or from States in which contests had been brought, serving on the committee, no detailed reports or statements were made by the minority except in the following cases: Ninth Alabama, four line protest in fourth California, fourth North Carolina, Texas, and Washington. In the last two cases the minority did not agree as to facts and signed two reports. It was claimed as an excuse for this failure to state reasons why the Roosevelt delegates should be seated that the minority did not have time to prepare reports. They certainly had as much time as the majority. What they lacked was not time but facts to support their contention. It is easy to make unwarranted assertions and to hurl offensive epithets, and these, and not facts have been relied upon to support these flimsy contests.

It will no doubt be urged that the fact that members of the national committee favoring Col. Roosevelt in a large number of cases voted against the seating of the Roosevelt contestants is evidence of the fact that they were entirely fair-minded and should be an argument in favor of their judgment in those cases in which they did vote to seat the Roosevelt delegates. I have no disposition to detract from any credit that may be due these gentlemen, but these hearings were public; all the world had access to the facts. The cases in which they voted to seat the Taft delegates were so clear and the contest of the Roosevelt delegates so flimsy that no man having the least regard for public opinion could have voted otherwise. In those cases where there was the slightest excuse for a difference of opinion they voted for the Roosevelt delegates invariably. In the cases before the credentials committee practically every avowed Roosevelt adherent voted in every case for the Roosevelt delegates, even in cases like the Indiana delegates at large, where the vote of the national committee had been unanimous.

OTHER CASES.

This I believe concludes the list of "tainted" seats. There are a number of other contests I should like to refer to if I had the time, particularly the case of the Indiana delegates at large.

Although the national committee had decided this case unanimously in favor of the Taft delegates, the committee on credentials was asked to take it up, and for more than three hours in the middle of the night we listened to declamations in regard to it.

I am now prepared to say I do not think there are many people who possess the nerve to argue a contest like this in the first instance. I know of but one man who would repeat the infliction.

INDIANA.

The contest in Indiana was based on alleged fraudulent voting in a *lawful and properly safeguarded primary* in the city of Indianapolis, and though general and sweeping claims of fraud were made in the manner truly characteristic of the Roosevelt contestants in all the cases, only three specific acts of illegal voting were charged out of 7,643 votes, of which Taft received a majority of 4,683.

The bringing of such a contest ought to subject those who bring it to the scorn of all right-thinking men, and yet Col. Roosevelt, if I recollect rightly, thundered right vigorously about the outrage committed by the Taft people in this case. No doubt he was imposed upon in this and other cases by those who claimed to know, in which event should we not have heard a retraction when he discovered the true situation?

RUMPS AND RIOTS.

One who has looked into the history of the contests before the Republican national convention can not help being impressed with the striking similarity of the methods employed in widely separated localities. Given a certain state of facts—for instance, a clear minority in a county, a district, or State convention—and the same procedure followed, whether it was in Washington, Michigan, or Alabama.

The stage was set in advance for a bolt or a riot, or both, by a plentiful supply of contests, and where the affair was in cool and practiced hands the entire procedure, including reports of committees that were never appointed, were made up beforehand. The procedure was so uniform everywhere that one is forced to the conclusion that it was all part of a deliberately planned and carefully executed scheme of campaigning.

REAL PRIMARIES AND SOAP-BOX PRIMARIES.

I can not close this statement without a word about primaries. It is superfluous to say that the ideal condition under a free government is one under which the people can express their will as directly as possible in the selection of those who are to serve them in official capacity. To accomplish this laudable purpose the direct primary has been quite generally adopted. *The success of the direct primary depends entirely on whether it is properly safeguarded.* If it be of such a character that the voters of one party can, through it, nominate the candidates of another it becomes a diabolical instrument for defeating the will of a majority of the people.

If, on the other hand, a procedure is had in the name of a primary around which no adequate safeguards are placed, at which repeating, ballot-box stuffing, the making of false returns, can be carried on with impunity, with scant chances of detection and no means of punishment if detected, the whole system of primaries will be brought into disrepute. We all know that in the case of a serious contest the ballot box must be guarded with the utmost care to prevent it being used to thwart rather than reflect the will of the people. Such soap-box primaries

as were attempted in Maricopa County, Ariz., and King County, Wash., would, if allowed to become general, seriously menace and finally destroy the primary system.

The attempt has been made, and no doubt will be made further, to mislead people into believing that the general attitude of the majority of the national and credentials committees was hostile to legal primaries. Nothing is further from the fact. In the fourth California case the contest was between delegates claiming to be elected at the same primaries. In no other case was the right of delegates elected as the result of a legal primary contested by the Taft people. On the contrary, the Roosevelt people challenged the overwhelming verdict of a legal primary in the case of the Indiana delegates at large. *Not a single delegate elected to the national convention as the result of a legal primary lost his seat on the contest of a delegate otherwise elected. The result of legal primaries—that is, primaries held under sanction of law—was invariably respected.*

CONCLUSION.

As admitted by the Roosevelt managers themselves, they started out deliberately at the beginning of the preconvention campaign to create contests. A large number of these contests were pure fiction, the contesting delegates claiming to be elected at conventions which, if held at all, were held a month or two after the regular conventions. Many of the contests which arose at the time conventions were held were the result of prearranged bolts based on the flimsiest pretexts. The great number of cases of conventions in which a disturbance was created, and the uniformly violent character of the same gives ample ground for the belief that it was part of the general plan of the Roosevelt managers.

Leaving out of consideration the contests admitted to be fictitious and "psycological," and coming down to the cases which were finally relied upon to support the claim of fraud, the facts in regard to them are as follows:

The Taft delegates from the ninth Alabama were entitled to their seats if the truth of every contention of the Roosevelt men were admitted.

The six Taft delegates at large from Arizona would have been elected just the same if the Roosevelt men had presented their contentions to the uncontested delegates to the State convention.

The Taft delegates from the fifth Arkansas were elected at the duly called convention held in the district; the other convention was a joke.

The Taft delegates from the fourth district of California had to be recognized or else deny the people of a district the right to elect their own delegates.

The Taft delegates from the thirteenth Indiana were elected at the only convention held in the district; the contestants were the product of a riot.

In the seventh and eighth Kentucky districts the Roosevelt delegates were the product of rump conventions, held because the Taft men had clear majorities in the regular conventions.

In the eleventh Kentucky district both sides sinned and each side was given one delegate.

The Michigan contest could only have been brought by men unable to realize the burlesque character of a procedure in which one-tenth of a convention attempted to control its deliberations. The bolters are now painfully divided between Wilson and Roosevelt.

The Taft delegates from the third Oklahoma were regularly elected at the district convention. The Roosevelt delegates were named at a small, select, unofficial gathering called as an afterthought.

The Taft delegates were elected at the regular conventions in the second and ninth Tennessee districts; the Roosevelt delegates were products of outfits which have been engaged for years in harassing Republican candidates.

The Taft delegates from Texas represented the large majority of the Republicans of the Lone Star State; the Roosevelt delegates represented the paper proxies from the prairie-dog counties held by Federal officials and patronage bosses.

A soap-box primary in Kings County, Wash., was made the excuse for a rump State convention by the Roosevelt people; the Taft delegates were elected at the regular convention. The soap-box primary was disposed of in the same way by both the Republican and Democratic conventions.

The action of the Republican national convention in the seating of delegates was correct, just, and equitable. Any honest jury having the facts before them would have decided the contests in the same way.

The proposition that electors on the Republican ticket in States which expressed a preference for Mr. Roosevelt shall, after having received the support which their position on the Republican ticket assures, cast their vote for the candidate of a third party has its alleged excuse in downright and persistent prevarication, on which rotten foundation it lays its proposal of treasonable larceny.

No one is justified in condemning the action of the Republican convention on mere hearsay, as has been largely done, and to be informed is to be convinced there is no ground for criticism. The convention acted honestly and in a spirit of fairness, in harmony with party history and for the best interests of the party and the American people. The violence of the attack on the party integrity has temporarily misled many good and well-meaning people, but the truth will triumph, the party be vindicated in its action, and its candidates elected. [Applause.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, to begin with, I desire to ask unanimous consent to print as a part of my remarks some statements to which I shall allude during the course of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] asks unanimous consent to print certain statements as a part of his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, one of these statements that I shall print in the RECORD was prepared by Mr. Sackett, a delegate from the State of Nebraska to the Chicago convention, and a member of the committee on credentials in that body.

I have submitted the statements that he has prepared to a member of the national committee who heard all the contests and all the controversies that were brought before that committee, and I have been assured by that man, a man whose name would be recognized by every man in this House, that the statement of Mr. Sackett is absolutely justified in every particular, and that he might even have gone further.

This statement, so far as it pertains to the State of Washington, was submitted to Judge Epperson, of Nebraska, a gentleman whom I have known for years, who heard the contests as to Washington and has examined all the evidence, and it has his approval.

I submitted, in substance, the statement of Mr. Sackett pertaining to a part of the contests from Washington, Texas, and Arizona to a man whose name, like that of the other gentleman, would be recognized not only here but all over the country, and who examined all the evidence and reported to me that the statement was practically correct, and that in his judgment there were nearly 50—I think he put it at that figure—or 48 delegates in the Republican convention that were taken away from Roosevelt and given to Taft—legally elected delegates unseated and illegal ones put in their places, without any excuse, without any reason—and that no man could reasonably reach any other conclusion from an examination of the evidence; and that he thought that 25 or 30 more were cases where honest men, reasonable men, examining the evidence, could honestly come to different conclusions as to the results.

I have examined everything pertaining to these contests that I have been able to get hold of, and have read everything that has been printed by those who have examined them—everything that I have been able to get—and I unhesitatingly say that I do not see how any reasonable man can examine the contests in Washington, California, Arizona, Texas, and some other States without coming to the conclusion that they were absolutely stolen in that convention. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to admit, to begin with, that honest men——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. In a moment. That honest men may listen to the same evidence and come to diametrically opposite conclusions, so that I am not going to charge any man with dishonesty because he does not agree with me in the conclusions that I have reached. I am responsible to my own conscience in my investigations, and I concede to every other man the same right.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not pretend to know anything about the facts, but I want to ask the gentleman this question. The gentleman spoke of some gentleman of very high standing who had passed upon the cases, as I understand, in the State of Washington. Is the gentleman going to give the name of that authority?

Mr. NORRIS. The authority I have mentioned I can not give. I can not give his name. I have mentioned two men whose judgment has been given to me whose names I can not use.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman this question——

Mr. NORRIS. I will anticipate the gentleman's question. I admit that that detracts from the force of the argument, but it does not detract from the effect it has on me, because I know

the men. One of these men whom I have mentioned, whose name is familiar to every Republican in the United States, is supporting Taft to-day. He explained—no, I will not say he explained, but I gathered it from his conversation—that he had political aspirations of his own, and that while he thought it was downright stealing, yet he believed that the best thing for him to do under all the circumstances was to go on and recognize Taft as the party leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman whether he thinks it fair, in view of the fact that he has said that the gentlemen, known throughout the country, have assured him to the effect that the delegation from the State of Washingon was stolen, that he should not give his authority?

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is fair. I have told the facts. I admit that it would not have as much weight with me as though the authority were given, and I assure the gentleman that I would be glad if I could give the name, but there are men all over the United States who feel the same way. [Applause.] These men are not coming out in public and telling their opinions, because they are afraid of the persecutions that would come to them, occupying certain positions as they do, on account of the political machine and the political faction that is now in power.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want to ask the gentleman whether he thinks it is fair to come in and quote authority of that kind when he knows in advance that he will not be permitted to give the name? Why does not the gentleman give the facts without quoting some one whom he will not name?

Mr. NORRIS. I am going to give the facts before I get through. I am talking about these statements that I intend to print, stating what the facts are. I have been trying to investigate to find out what was the actual fact in every case in order to satisfy my own mind.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman ought to state it, and not call upon an authority that he can not quote.

Mr. NORRIS. I am going to state it, if the gentleman will hold himself in peace and give me time, and I will not take two hours and a half to do it, either.

Mr. Chairman, as a Republican I submit to Republicans and to citizens of the country that if I come to the conclusion that a nominee in my party has been given the nomination by fraudulent, dishonorable means, it is not only my duty as a citizen, but as a member of the Republican Party, to denounce it and to denounce it openly. [Applause.]

TAFT'S MAJORITY ONLY 19.

Mr. Taft's alleged nomination was obtained in Chicago by a majority of 21. Bear that in mind. Two of those came from Massachusetts, and it is admitted that if there had been a roll call in which the Roosevelt men were voting those two men would have voted and their alternates would not have been allowed to vote. So, regardless of what we may think about the ruling of Chairman ROOT, those votes ought not to be counted, because if there had been a real contest, it is admitted even by the Taft fellows that Taft would not have received those two votes. So Mr. Taft's majority was 19. If, therefore, 19 delegates were placed on the roll of that convention by fraudulent, dishonorable, or illegal means, then Mr. Taft's nomination is tained with fraud. It is null, it is void, and is entitled to no consideration from anybody. Fraud has vitiated contracts from the beginning of civilization, and fraud ought, and at least in a moral sense does, vitiate a nomination, even though there is no law that can control national conventions.

PRIMARIES.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has had considerable to say about soap-box primaries. I wanted to ask him a question, but he would not yield so that I could. The question would develop this fact, that wherever the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in his two and one-half hours of laboring could find a place where some Taft delegates were elected at a primary, he told us about it. I was going to ask the gentleman the question, and I think the record will show that in no instance where there was a primary did they refuse to give the Taft delegates the vote of that primary and give Mr. Taft the benefit of whatever advantage that might be. And I think the reverse is true, that in every case where there was a primary which elected Roosevelt delegates that primary was called a soap-box primary, it was called fraudulent, and it was said that there was no law controlling it, and that they had no way to tell what the honest vote was. They talk about the primary in Indianapolis being an honest primary because Taft won out there. Oh, that was a virtuous affair. I remember meeting a Member of this House the day after they held that primary, and he said, "Taft got a great big majority in Indianapolis and I am sorry that the Republicans thought it was necessary to stuff the ballot boxes down there, because they did not need to. We could have beaten the Roosevelt fellows without it."

The Indianapolis papers announced that there was fraud there. I am not claiming anything for Indianapolis. I am not going to try to take it away from Taft, because I do not know how much fraud there was there. The vote was given to him and I have no knowledge to claim to the contrary, and hence I am not finding fault with it. I refer to it only to show how the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] loves a primary when it goes for Taft and how he hates it and despises it when it goes against him.

In the State of Washington there were primaries that went for Taft. The gentleman from Wyoming takes the pains to mention that here. There was no contest over them. Nobody is claiming that they ought to be taken away from Taft. Everybody has conceded that those counties ought to be given to him; but he repeated it over and over, "Oh, here was a primary away up there in the country that went for Taft."

But down in King County, in the same State—and I suppose they did not have a different law in one part of Washington from what they had in another—there was a primary that Roosevelt carried. I wanted to ask the gentleman, but he would not permit an interruption, whether anybody has ever made any charge before his committee or elsewhere that there was one single fraud committed in that primary? The newspapers of Washington had no record of it afterwards.

The gentleman says that anybody might have gone in there and voted at that primary, that anybody could have voted and there would have been no law to punish him. The same thing is true in all of the other primaries that went for Taft, but they were virtuous. On the other hand, nobody has ever claimed that any illegal vote was cast there, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] did not even claim it. It is conceded by both sides that if King County, in Washington, were given to the Roosevelt delegates, then they had a large majority in the State convention. But I am going to demonstrate to you that even if you give King County to the Taft delegates, there are three other counties that are just as meritorious, if not more so, than the King County proposition, and every one of them had to be given to Taft to save Roosevelt from having control of that convention.

WASHINGTON.

In the Washington State convention there were 668 delegates. Half of that number would be 334, and a majority would be 335. There were in the State convention of Washington, and it is uncontroverted by the Taft people, 263 uncontested delegates for Roosevelt and 97 uncontested ones for Taft. There were two counties—Pierce and Clallam—in which contests were decided by the Taft State committee in favor of the Roosevelt delegates. These two counties had 69 delegates. These 69 delegates added to Roosevelt's 263 uncontested delegates gave him 332 delegates, just 3 delegates short of a majority. I am now going to consider the contested cases from four counties: Asotin County with 6 delegates, Chelan County with 10 delegates, Mason County with 8 delegates, and King County with 121 delegates. It will be observed that if Roosevelt was entitled to any one of these delegations, he would have had control of the Washington State convention, even though all the others had been given to Taft. I shall show, and I think conclusively, that the Roosevelt delegates in every one of these counties were honestly, lawfully, and fairly elected and entitled to seats in the convention. The State committee, however, unseated all of the Roosevelt delegates from these counties, and without any reason, and absolutely contrary to the evidence, seated the Taft delegates.

The call for the State convention permitted the county committees to select delegates themselves if they wanted to, and it permitted them to call a convention to select delegates, or to call a primary for the selection of delegates. Any one of those methods was allowable and legal, and all were pursued in different parts of the State. Some of the delegates were selected by a committee, in some instances for Taft, and in some instances for Roosevelt. Some were selected at conventions and some at primaries. Both sides agree that any one of these three methods, if agreed upon by the county committee, would be lawful under the call and under the laws of the State of Washington.

ASOTIN COUNTY.

In Asotin County, pursuant to a call, a county convention was held and 6 Roosevelt delegates elected. The county committee consisted of 11—1 from each precinct. Three members of this committee, without any call or notice, together with 2

other persons not pretending to be members and not even pretending to hold proxies, appointed the 6 Taft delegates that were illegally given seats in the State convention.

CHELAN COUNTY.

In Chelan County, where they had 10 delegates, a convention was called in the regular way, and nobody disputed it. They met in convention and elected a temporary chairman. There were 55 delegates in the convention. There were three contests from three precincts. The temporary organization was formed and a committee on credentials was appointed. This meeting was in the forenoon, and it was participated in by Roosevelt men and Taft men. They adjourned until 1 o'clock to let the credentials committee report on those contests. After they had adjourned, and during this recess, a minority of the convention met secretly in a room and selected delegates to the State convention and instructed them for Taft. At 1 o'clock, the hour of reconvening, the convention again assembled. The report of the committee on credentials was heard. It was acted on in the convention. They elected delegates to the State convention and instructed them for Roosevelt. The Taft State committee seated the Taft delegation. They had to, because if they had not it would have given a majority in the State convention, according to their own figures, to the Roosevelt delegates.

MASON COUNTY.

In Mason County there are 21 precincts. No county convention was held, but there were two delegations, one for Taft and one for Roosevelt. The county committee consisted of 21 members, 1 from each precinct. At a meeting of this committee, at which 11 members were present, a delegation to the State convention was elected and instructed for Roosevelt. The Taft contesting delegation was selected by two members of the county committee without any call or notice of meeting. The State committee seated the Taft delegation, because it was absolutely necessary to do so in order to control the convention for Taft.

Any one of those counties, if decided properly, would have changed the result in the Washington convention, according to the figures of the Taft people themselves.

KING COUNTY.

Now we come to King County. That is the county where Seattle is located. The gentleman from Wyoming had a great deal to say about the soap-box primaries there, and one of the arguments he uses is that in the same primary there were Democrats selected. That is, the Democrats held a primary at the same time and elected their delegates, and they were contested, and the Democratic convention threw them out. That only illustrates what I have so often contended here and elsewhere, namely, that the Democratic machine and the Republican machine are one and the same. They are oiled from the same oil can; they drink out of the same canteen. But if it is a good thing to follow Democratic precedents, then why does not the gentleman from Wyoming follow it in California? A Republican committee threw out California, but the Democratic committee did not. The gentleman from Wyoming has much to say in favor of Democracy. In fact, the action of those committees in Chicago was all in favor of Democratic success. They have done more to bring about the possibility of Democratic victory than the Democratic Party ever did or ever was competent to do. The gentleman from Wyoming compares the Republicans of Pennsylvania with the Democrats of Missouri, and he shows in the comparison how much better the Democrats of Missouri are than the Republicans of Pennsylvania. There was unanimity between the Taft Republicans and the Democrats that has been noticeable. In this House, when the Republican convention was on in Chicago, and the committees were stealing a whole lot of votes, no one on earth felt better about it than did the Democrats in this body.

In the confidence of the cloakroom they would speak out their feelings, and it was always one way. There is a unison between the Taft Republicans and the Democrats. I think it is conceded, confidentially at least by all Republicans, that Taft can not possibly be elected and that his running on a trumped-up nomination can only result in Democratic votes for the Democratic candidate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I congratulate those Republicans who have so often condemned me and others because I have associated with Democrats that at last they are and have been doing from the very beginning just exactly what the Democrats want them to do. The Taft Republicans and the machine Democrats are together. They are "two souls with but a single thought; two hearts that beat as one." They are all working for Democratic success. But, Mr. Chairman, to return to King County.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Would it not be more plausible instead of believing Taft Republicans and Democrats were working together that the Democrats should believe in the old maxim that when thieves fall out and fight honest men will get their dues? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NORRIS. Well, the Democrats who confidentially told what they thought in the cloakrooms of this House did not state that. They were shivering in their boots for fear Taft would not be nominated and they were trembling in their shoes for fear Roosevelt would. The facts are, when the Democratic convention met at Baltimore the man you selected as temporary chairman and who was supposed to make the keynote speech devoted all of his time to an attack on Roosevelt and paid no attention to Taft. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is another evidence of this fusion and unison. Everybody knows the fight is between Roosevelt and Wilson. Let us now return to King County. Now, King County was entitled to 121 votes—121 delegates. The city of Seattle, on account of a large increase in population and according to the law of that State, had to be redistricted, and in the redistricting there were 131 voting precincts added.

There were in round numbers something like 250 members of that county committee at the time; and the chairman, according to the custom, that has had no exception as far as I know, filled these vacancies by appointment. The committee met under the call of the State convention. I have never heard, and the gentleman from Wyoming did not seriously contend, that the chairman did not have the right to fill those vacancies. So the committee met and determined to have a primary, and they called it. No one denies but what under the call of the State committee they had the right to call the primary; and in that primary 6,900 Republican votes were cast. Taft got about 500 and Roosevelt got most of the balance—practically all the balance. Now, they state this is an illegal primary. Let us see what the contrary is. The majority of this committee authorized a call of the primary. They had authority to do it under the call from the State committee. How did the Taft delegates get a showing? Let me tell you. In the campaign preceding—the year before—there was an executive committee having charge of the campaign. At this meeting of the central committee, where this primary was called, a resolution was passed doing away with that executive committee. Its functions were performed; it had no further authority anyway, even if they had not passed that resolution; but they passed the resolution discharging the committee. What happened? When they called this primary 14 men out of these 22 members of that old committee got together without any notice, without any publicity, and without any authority, and selected 121 men to go to the Republican State convention, and that is the authority of the so-called Taft delegation which went from King County. Now, let us see. Suppose you say that the primary was illegal. There is no legality in 14 men selecting a delegation. They had no more authority to select those delegates than I had. It was absolutely a nullity. I do not think and I do not believe any reasonable man can reach the conclusion that the so-called Roosevelt delegates selected at the primary were illegal; but even if you believe that, you must admit that the Taft delegates were illegal.

Which one then in justice should be recognized, one selected at a primary open and above board against which no man has said there was anything illegal or wrong or dishonorable, where the Republicans could come out and vote, and about 8,000 of them did come out and vote, or to recognize a delegation of 121 men, selected by 14 men, who simply took it upon themselves to do it, and who had no authority whatever.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In regard to King County and Whatcom County——

Mr. NORRIS. I simply yielded for the gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It will be but a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to take up two and a half hours, but I am perfectly willing to yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will make it a question, and I will make it short. King and Whatcom Counties are two of the largest counties in my district. You contend that the primary should have been held in King County; why was it contested in Whatcom County?

Mr. NORRIS. I did not contest it——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Roosevelt men did.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not help that. I am not here defending anything that is wrong because it was done by Roosevelt men any quicker than I will fight it when it is done by Taft men. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In Whatcom County they held the primary by agreement——

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And the Roosevelt people were defeated, and two or three weeks after they convened——

Mr. NORRIS. And the contest was dismissed; they never got the vote, and Taft did, and properly so. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Washington did not state that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They met by agreement, and the Roosevelt people refused——

Mr. NORRIS. And contested it, and they went to the committee and the committee turned the Roosevelt people down; and I am not objecting to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was the Taft people who turned them down.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course it was, and they did right. That is a case where they did right. They stumble on that once in awhile, but not often. When the Roosevelt men institute a contest that is wrong they ought to be defeated. In the cases the gentleman mentions the Taft delegates won. They were given the seats, and I am not complaining, and as far as I know no one else is finding fault.

They say, "Why, here is a contest down in Louisiana; it had nothing back of it, nothing to give it any foundation, and we decided it against Roosevelt. And," they say, "even the Roosevelt men on the committee voted to decide it against Roosevelt." That is commendable of them. They were honest. They were not there to steal. They were there to do right. But the argument of those who defend the robbery at Chicago is that because they found a contest instituted by Roosevelt men to be without merit, therefore they were justified in deciding all contests against the Roosevelt delegates, without regard to merit.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to finish up this question first.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would like to ask the question whether he thinks the argument of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] was any more unfair than to quote some man as being high authority——

Mr. NORRIS. I will not go over that now.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Let me finish my question.

Mr. NORRIS. I know what the gentleman is going to say, and I have admitted to the gentleman that his criticism is just. I know it is; I acknowledge it. I would be as glad as the gentleman would be if I could give the name of every authority I have cited——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. You already have it, saying that he was an honest man, that you could not mention it because he did not want it known, and that he was supporting Taft because he wanted to get into office.

Mr. NORRIS. If everybody who is supporting Taft because he either has or expects to get an office is dishonest, then Taft's honest supporters will be reduced so that you can number them on the fingers of your hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yet you quote them to support your case.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman can ask me a question, but do not make an argument.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If I can ask a question without having any more noise about it than necessary, I would ask you if you did not quote here as evidence——

Mr. NORRIS. I know what the gentleman is going to say, and I have been over it and I have stated it repeatedly. Now, the gentleman ought to be courteous enough to let me go on. I know what the gentleman is going to say——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. You know what I am going to say, and that is the reason you do not want me to ask it.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman has already asked it once, and I have gone over it and explained my position.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. You have not permitted me to ask it yet, and the reason is that you know what I am going to ask. It is 120 miles away——

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Washington, if I am interrupting him——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am not interrupting the gentleman.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman is talking aloud here. If I annoy him, I apologize for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman need not get disturbed.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not disturbed. I wanted to give the gentleman a free rein if he wanted it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for order. I want to hear this discussion, and can not hear two of them at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is well taken. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is clearly out of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman from Nebraska will keep still——

Mr. NORRIS. I am not going to keep still. I have taken the floor for the purpose of doing otherwise. That is my privilege.

Now, then, I was asking the question, I believe, what would be a fair-minded man's duty with these two propositions, one delegation selected at a primary where 7,000 Republicans participated, and there were 6,500 votes for one set of delegates, and another delegate was selected in secret by 14 men without any authority? That is the case of King County.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Is there any great distinction in theory between 14 men selecting 121 delegates and 1 man selecting 131 and permitting them to call a primary?

Mr. NORRIS. It depends altogether on the authority of the 1 and the authority of the 14. If the 1 had the authority, his action is right.

If the 1 man had authority to do what he did—and in this case I do not believe anybody seriously questions it—then his action was legal. If the 14 men selected delegates and had no authority whatever to do it, then the delegates they selected had no title whatever; the action was entirely illegal. This, it is true, is a technical view of the situation; but, be as technical as you will, you can not find any excuse or any authority for the selection of the Taft delegation of 121 men from King County. But for a moment let us lay aside technicalities and take a broad view of the situation. The question of authority is important, but what did the people who were given authority do after they received it? Suppose the appointments by the chairman to fill these 121 vacancies be considered absolutely illegal. After this appointment by the chairman gave to these precinct committeemen their power, what did they do with it? They turned it all back to the rank and file of the Republican Party. They, in connection with the old members of the committee, called a primary, so if any power had been given to them illegally their first official act was to surrender it back to the party. It seems to me the most technical man could not complain, and even if you honestly believe that the chairman had no right to fill these vacancies it must nevertheless be admitted that the filling of them by the chairman resulted in nothing further than to give the people belonging to the Republican Party an opportunity to control that party. If these men were given power wrongfully, it must at least be said in their defense that they did not abuse, they did not even use it; they surrendered it all back, giving every Republican of King County an opportunity to be heard and to have his influence felt in the contest.

On the other hand, what can be said of these 14 men? They were members of a committee of 22 who had charge of the campaign the year before. Their duties were fulfilled; their functions had been performed; they had nothing further to do. Even though no resolution had been passed discharging them, they would have had no power to select a delegation to the State convention, but before they ever attempted to exercise such a function or to pick delegates the committee passed a resolution formally discharging them. Notwithstanding this, 14 men, who in the year preceding had constituted part of the committee to manage the campaign, got together in secret and selected 121 delegates from King County to the State convention. Here was an exercise of power by men who had no authority. Contrast their action with the action of the committee in calling the primary. They took away from the people all power and assumed it all unto themselves. They were opposed to giving the Republicans of King County an opportunity to select delegates to the State convention. Of course their real reason was that they knew in a primary Taft delegates would be defeated. They assumed that they knew what was better for the Republicans of King County than the Republicans did themselves, and so with their superior wisdom, without a vestige of authority, without any reason or without any right, they relieved the Republicans of King County of all responsibility and selected 121 delegates.

The Taft delegation from King County was seated by the State committee. As I have already shown, Roosevelt only lacked three votes of a majority of the State convention, as shown by the figures of the Taft fellows themselves, so it was necessary that this entire delegation, in the words of the Texas manager, should be "captured." The gentleman from Wyoming has criticized this primary because there was not a larger vote cast. He makes the statement that there were 75,000 Republican voters in King County. The gentleman is, of course, mistaken in this assertion, badly mistaken. The official records

of the State of Washington show that at the last congressional election the Republican candidate for Congress, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] received in King County 16,082 votes. In round numbers there was actually cast at this primary 8,000 Republican votes. This is not a bad showing, and demonstrates, I think, that a reasonably large percentage of the Republican vote was cast at that primary. At least, it seems to me fair to say that, waiving all technicalities and all other considerations, it would be better to let 8,000 Republicans of King County select a delegation to represent them than it would be to let 14 men, meeting in secret, do the selecting.

In the last congressional election the official records show that in the whole State of Washington there were only 79,003 votes for the Republican candidates, only a few more than the gentleman from Wyoming claims for King County alone. There is another important piece of evidence that will have a bearing on the size of the primary vote in King County. I understand the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Republican member of this House, who represents the district in which King County is located, was nominated the last time he ran for Congress at a primary, and it is interesting to note that the first-choice vote by which the gentleman carried King County was 9,588, practically the same Republican vote that was cast in this despised primary that elected Roosevelt delegates to the State convention. Surely the gentleman from Wyoming would not ask our colleague from Washington to resign because he was nominated at a primary where there were so few votes cast. Surely he would not go so far as to even hint at the legality of the title to his seat here because in his own home county these 75,000 Republicans that the gentleman from Wyoming says live there forgot to come out and vote at the primaries.

Later on, in my remarks in connection with my discussion of the power of patronage, I will have something further to say in regard to the State convention of Washington, and will show how the trick was done and by whom it was performed.

CALIFORNIA.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there were two delegates from California that were stolen. The State of California through her legislature passed a State-wide primary law, a law providing for a primary for the election of delegates to the national conventions. That law provided that these delegates should be elected in the State at large. The law went into effect, and the Republican Party—both factions of it, all factions of it—and the Democratic Party and all factions of that accepted its provisions.

Not only was this law acted upon and respected and accepted by all factions, but Mr. Taft himself signed and filed with the secretary of state of California an official document that gave him the benefits of this law in the California contest. The law had a provision in it by which any candidate for President could file with the secretary of state his accepted list of delegates favorable to his candidacy, so as to give him the benefit of having his delegates printed on the ballot in a group and also to give his supporters in the State his official statement as to the delegates that he desired elected from the State to the national convention. Mr. Taft went into the contest and filed with the secretary of state of California his indorsement of 26 men whom he desired elected under that law as delegates to the Chicago convention. I have a certified copy of this document and it reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1912.

CHAS. M. HAMMOND, *San Francisco, Cal.:*

I indorse your selection of the following 26 candidates for delegates to the national convention:

(Here follow the names of the 26 Taft delegates.)

WM. H. TAFT.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state the 26th day of March, 1912, at 9 o'clock a. m.

FRANK C. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

After going into this California contest and atfer Mr. Taft had specifically, over his own signature, accepted the benefits of the law, it seems to me that it comes with poor grace, after he had been defeated by an overwhelming majority, for anyone in his behalf to set up the flimsy excuse that the law of California should not be respected because it conflicted with a rule of the national committee. If it was the intention of the Taft men to make this contention, it would rather seem to me, in all honor and honesty, they ought to have made it before they went into the contest under the law and tried to get the delegation through the law. Mr. Taft is a lawyer of sufficient ability to know that from the beginning of civilization, his conduct in the contest in California would certainly have estopped him, or anyone in his behalf, from trying to nullify the State statute after he had been defeated in the contest and after he had accepted the provisions of the statute. It is a pitiable spectacle and not a very bright one to place before the rising generation to have the President of the United States go into a contest of this kind and specifically accept a law and then, after he is defeated, to see his supporters openly and defiantly nullify this law and setting up a rule of a political committee as a defense of their action. The case of the bosses at Chicago must have been desperate indeed if, in addition to going so far as to nullify the laws of a sovereign State, they should also put their own candidate for whose benefit they were perpetrating the robbery in such an unenviable and undesirable position before the American people.

The reasoning of the men who would follow the action taken at Chicago in nullifying the laws of the State of California would lead us to the greatest of absurdities. Suppose one of our States, Iowa for instance, decided to enact a presidential primary law. No one denies but what Iowa ought to have the right to do it. There is no inhibition in the United States Constitution to such action. All men of progressive ideas admit that every State ought to have such a law, but, disregarding the merits of the case, all men ought to be willing to admit that Iowa should be permitted to make whatever law she desired on the subject.

If the reasoning of the Taft people in Chicago is correct, the lawmakers of the Iowa Legislature, before they enacted their statute, would have to make an examination of the rules and regulations of the Republican committee and see that their proposed primary law would not conflict with the rules of this committee—a committee entirely outside of any law, a committee that is not governed by any law. And so the citizens of Iowa, before they could enact a law that would be workable and entitle their delegates to admission to a national convention, would have to consult the edicts and the rules of this committee. Suppose they did this and enacted their law in accordance with the national committee's rules, what assurance have the people of Iowa that, even before their law can go into effect, the national committee will not meet and pass other rules and regulations that would nullify their law. The national committee, controlled as it has been controlled in the past by the political machine, being opposed to the election of delegates by primaries, because in that way it takes away their power, would be able to nullify any and every law that any or every sovereign State of the Union might pass. What a spectacle it would be for the governor or a committee of the legislators from Iowa to go to Chicago or to Boston or to New York to consult the political bosses and find out from them whether they had in contemplation any change in the rules of the national committee in order that the sovereign State of Iowa might be assured that these self-constituted political bosses would not nullify and abrogate any law that Iowa might pass.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I do.

Mr. KENT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that at the time this law was passed the Republican organization of California was hostile to President Taft and had absolute authority to elect all delegates hostile to him?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I am aware of that fact. I myself, when that question was up in California, wired to some of the officials there, knowing that the progressives there had advocated a primary for delegates to the convention, and that they had obtained complete control of the Republican machinery, and under the law of California as then constituted they could have selected the delegates absolutely. They had it secure, and some people thought they ought to give the machine a dose of its own medicine and select delegates in that way. I urged them to pass a presidential primary law. The progressive Republicans of California, in control of the legislature, and, notwithstanding the fact that they also had control of the Republican machinery and could have named every delegate to the Republican convention, passed a State-wide primary providing that the delegates should be elected by the people of the whole State. The Roosevelt delegates were elected by about 77,000 plurality over the Taft men. Nobody disputes that. Each of the delegates received a certificate of election and went to Chicago. But when they came to Chicago the national committee threw out two of those men and put in two Taft men.

It is claimed in the speech of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that this law of California conflicted with the order and the rule of the national Republican committee. Have we come to the position where any national committee, without any law to control it, without any power or anybody to control it, can pass rules that shall nullify the laws of sovereign States? Then it is time that we should know it.

Well, let us see what happened. They put on two Taft men in place of the two Roosevelt men that they took off. By what right did they put them on? Nobody had contested their seats.

Nobody had called any other primary or convention in any district or had made any protest whatever. No convention, no committee, nobody, had done anything in California to question the legality of every one of these 26 delegates who were elected by 77,000 plurality.

It is said, "Why, the whole State might have been thrown out." The facts are, Mr. Chairman, that this national committee wanted to establish a precedent by which it could nullify a State statute. If it is right and that precedent must stand, then in four years from now that self-perpetuating machine, the national committee, can nullify any law or statute passed in any of the States. It can, with the same authority and the same power, nullify the primary law in my State, which provides that delegates shall be elected by districts, and not in the State as a whole, as was done in the State of California. They can, the next time, make a rule that the only electors elected by a primary that can sit in a convention shall be those that are elected as they elect them now in California. The real purpose there is to make this machine self-perpetuating. They have robbed the Republican Party of their expression and their right to control the national convention now. They were only preparing, when they stole the two delegates from California, to commit the same crime again four years from now, and to establish a precedent for it.

Why, the gentleman from Wyoming said they could have taken the whole State. True enough; they might. They were all powerful. I could, on the same theory of the gentleman from Wyoming, and those who follow that theory, if I am arrested for stealing horses and I am brought to trial, offer as a defense that the barn out of which I stole the horse contained two horses and I stole only one; and on their theory I will not only be entitled to a verdict of not guilty for larceny, but I will be entitled to a legal title to the horse that I did steal. [Laughter and applause.]

TEXAS.

Now, I am going to take up the contests from the State of Texas. The State of Texas is a southern State, and the argument of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in favor of the Taft delegates from Texas is rather amusing. He shows that Federal officeholders down in Texas were overriding the Taft fellows and controlling conventions. Maybe it is true; but what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander. If you will take away from Taft the delegates that came to him from the States where I believe they were absolutely stolen, and those from the South that came to him by virtue of patronage alone, he would not have a handful of delegates left. Everybody knows it. [Applause.]

In the State of Texas there was an open contest between the Taft followers and the Roosevelt followers which the entire country watched with considerable interest. Texas was the one southern State where the national committeeman of the State was opposing the administration and supporting Roosevelt. In that State practically all of the contests were brought by the Taft people. The State convention was controlled by the Roosevelt followers, and nearly every congressional district convention was controlled in the same way. The regularity that the gentleman from Wyoming claims on behalf of all the Taft delegates from the South is lacking in the State of Texas. As I said, the whole country watched the contest, and it was generally understood throughout the United States at the time that the Roosevelt men were successful. It did not dawn on the public mind for some time afterwards that the Taft people were industriously working up contest cases and making a determined effort to steal the delegation at Chicago. The man who had charge of the Taft campaign in Texas was H. F. MacGregor, and it must be said to the credit of Mr. MacGregor that he conducted his fight in a very open-handed way. He made no secret of the fact that those who were faithful and helped in the Taft cause should be rewarded in the way of patronage. He had two able lieutenants in his fight. One was a man by the name of W. B. Brush, of Austin, Tex., and the other was James W. A. Clark, of Corsicana. They issued definite instructions in writing to the Taft followers. They deliberately started out with a conspiracy to contest every convention that they could not capture. They tried to browbeat public officials and gave everybody to understand that those who were faithful would be rewarded and that those who supported Roosevelt would be punished. Later on in my remarks, when I intend to discuss at more length the question and the evils of patronage, I shall refer again to these men and read portions of their published correspondence.

It is sufficient to say at present that these subordinates were instructed by the Taft managers to contest every delegation that they could not control and to bolt wherever they were in the minority and elect a contesting delegation. In one of the letters the boss, in giving his instructions, used this language: "Capture if you can, but do not be captured." As will be seen in the examination of the evidence in the various districts of Texas, these instructions were carried out to the letter. Wherever the Taft fellows could not control the convention they always bolted; they always elected contesting delegations, and in Chicago these contesting delegations were always seated. Very seldom did they even attempt to give a reason for their bolt. Through all the contests of Texas very little, if any, evidence will be found of any irregularity on the part of the Roosevelt delegates, and in no case where a contesting Taft delegation was seated will there be found any evidence of regularity or legality of the Taft delegations.

Notwithstanding these methods, the State convention of Texas was controlled by an overwhelming majority in favor of Roosevelt, and most of the congressional district conventions were controlled in the same way. Texas was entitled to eight delegates from the State at large. The State of Texas has a law providing for the holding of the State convention, and the Republican State convention was called pursuant to that statute. Texas has 249 counties within its boundaries. There were delegates to the State convention from 208 of these counties. The original credentials of the delegates in these 208 counties were introduced before the credentials committee at Chicago, and no one, as far as I know, has denied or disputed their legality or validity. In the other 41 counties there were no conventions or primaries held and no representation from them either for Roosevelt or for Taft.

In the entire State there were contests in the State convention from 17 counties. The regular State committee, composed of both Roosevelt and Taft men, and by a unanimous vote, referred these contests to four subcommittees, and on each one of these four subcommittees were both Roosevelt and Taft representatives. After hearing the contests the subcommittees reported to the full committee the result of their investigations. The report of three of these subcommittees was unanimous and was approved by the full committee. In the other subcommittee there was a minority report filed by a Taft member, in which he differed from the Roosevelt members of the committee on only two counties, so that, as far as the State committee was concerned, there was a unanimous conclusion reached by both Taft and Roosevelt men on all the contests except from these two counties. Of the 17 counties contested, Taft delegates were seated from 4 counties and one-half of the Taft delegation from 4 counties, and the Roosevelt delegations were seated from 9 counties. The action of these subcommittees was approved by the whole committee by a vote of 28 to 2, and included in the 28 were 3 Taft members. The other 2 members gave notice that they would present a minority report to the convention as to these two counties, but, as a matter of fact, there was no evidence anywhere to show that any such minority report was ever presented. The report of this committee was unanimously adopted and approved by the State convention when it convened. In the entire State there were 27 counties that instructed for Taft, and 13 of these 27 counties remained in and took part in the State convention. The convention elected delegates and instructed them for Roosevelt by a majority of more than 10 to 1. No one anywhere at any time has questioned the regularity either prior to or during the State convention. There was no evidence whatever offered before the national committee or the committee on credentials that could possibly be construed to give any legality to the Taft delegation from Texas.

The Taft delegation was selected at a meeting that had no authority whatever. It did not even pretend to have any semblance of regularity. There could not have been present delegates from to exceed 14 counties. The meeting was held without any notice, without any call; in fact, it was a secret meeting. There was no roll call, no pretense at organization in the way of appointing a committee on credentials or otherwise, and no credentials were presented. No call of the counties was had.

Notwithstanding this, the Taft delegates from Texas were seated and the legally elected Roosevelt delegates were thrown out. In most of the congressional districts from Texas the work of the national committee and the credentials committee was as flagrant and unfair as it was in regard to the delegates from the State convention.

FOURTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

The fourth district affords a remarkable exhibition of the determination of the Taft managers to either rule or ruin. There are five counties in this district. There were contests presented from two precincts in two different counties, one from Collin and one from Grayson. The men presenting these contests had been denied admission in the county convention of the two counties mentioned. The convention was organized

in the regular way, at the time and place provided for in the call, and four out of five counties, with regularly and lawfully elected delegates, took part. Delegates to the national convention were elected and instructed for Roosevelt. The delegates from the county that did not take part, at a later time and at another place, together with the men presenting contests from the two precincts mentioned, held a convention and elected Taft delegates. The evidence in this case discloses that there was no claim of irregularity, excepting from these two precincts. No one has denied at any time but what the Roosevelt delegates were regularly and lawfully elected; that they held their county conventions and the district conventions according to law and at the time and place name in the call, which was regularly and lawfully issued. Of course, it was necessary in Chicago to give the Taft men a control of that convention that some legally elected delegates instructed for Roosevelt should be thrown out, and I presume they considered they might as well throw them out from this district as from any other, and so the steam roller crushed the life out of the Roosevelt delegates and these Taft delegates were seated, who had no more claim and no more right to seats in the national convention at Chicago than they did at Baltimore.

FIFTH DISTRICT.

The fifth congressional district of Texas is composed of five counties. There were contests from three out of the five counties. It should be observed that in this district the congressional committee was controlled by Taft men, and the committee thus controlled decided the contests in favor of the Roosevelt delegates. The convention then went ahead and elected delegates in the regular way and instructed them for Roosevelt. Ellis County was one of the counties in this district. The delegates from this county were instructed for Taft, but remained in the convention and participated in its action. Notwithstanding this, the delegates from this county, together with the Taft delegates from one other county that had been denied seats in the regular convention, met together and selected a set of Taft delegates, and the national committee and the credentials committee at Chicago, following their usual course, gave these illegally elected delegates seats in the convention.

SEVENTH DISTRICT.

The seventh congressional district of Texas comprises eight counties. Six out of the eight were carried by Roosevelt, and the Roosevelt delegates had an overwhelming majority in the district convention. Two conventions were held. The delegates from the six counties held a convention and selected Roosevelt delegates. No question was ever raised anywhere as to the regularity of the delegates from these six counties. No one, so far as I know, has ever denied that their election was even irregular in the minutest detail, but notwithstanding this, the delegates elected for Taft by the two counties composed of only a small minority of the delegation were seated in Chicago.

EIGHTH DISTRICT.

In the eighth district of Texas there are nine counties. Six of these counties were carried by Roosevelt men and the delegates from the other two counties were in favor of Taft. The Taft delegates from these two counties bolted from the regular convention and held a rump convention, but the delegates elected by them were seated in Chicago with the usual regularity. No one has ever questioned the regularity of the convention in this district that was controlled by Roosevelt delegates, and no one has ever given any reason why the Taft delegates bolted and held a separate convention, excepting that they were unable to control the convention, and, as I shall show later on from printed letters of the Taft managers in Texas, the action of the Taft delegates in this district convention, the same as their action in the other Texas district conventions, was taken according to the written instructions of the Taft managers.

NINTH DISTRICT.

In the ninth district there were two district conventions. One was called by the regular congressional district committee through its chairman. A large majority of the delegates took part in this convention. At this convention Roosevelt delegates were elected. The other convention, which elected Taft delegates, was called by a man who was chairman of one of the county committees. He had no authority either under law or any rule or regulation of the party. The convention which he called was participated in by a minority of the delegates. In this district it was known before either convention met that a large majority of the delegates to the convention were for Roosevelt, and the Taft delegates therefore refused to meet in convention with the Roosevelt fellows, and according to instructions from the Taft managers they saw that they could not "capture" and therefore obeyed the command and kept out of the regular convention so they could not "be captured."

TENTH DISTRICT.

The tenth district of Texas comprises eight counties. No one has denied or disputed the regularity or the legality of this convention. After the convention met, however, the delegates from two counties and a part of a third county under the leadership of a United States internal-revenue collector and the postmaster at Austin, bolted and held a rump convention. This rump convention elected two Taft delegates and, of course, the national committee and the committee on credentials put them on the roll at Chicago.

FOURTEENTH DISTRICT.

In the fourteenth congressional district of Texas there are 14 counties. The congressional convention was called by the congressional committee. In this convention there was but one contest. The contest was compromised, and both the Taft and the Roosevelt delegates were seated, giving to each delegate one-half of a vote. When the Taft delegates in this convention discovered that they were in a very small minority and that they could not "capture" the convention, they bolted. The delegates from three of the counties, one of which was the county that was contested, left the convention and elected Taft delegates. The regular convention performed its function in due form and elected Roosevelt delegates.

I have thus far considered 22 delegates from Texas. I have considered only those about which, in my judgment, there can be no possibility of a doubt. You must remember, as I explained yesterday in my remarks, that if it be shown that 19 of President Taft's delegates in Chicago held their seats illegally and fraudulently then his nomination must of necessity be illegal, null, and void. These cases that I have taken up, from Texas alone, are sufficient to nullify Mr. Taft's nomination.

FEDERAL PATRONAGE.

The gentleman from Wyoming goes on to say that postmasters and Federal officeholders down in Texas controlled conventions and selected delegates. He goes on to show that under the control of the national committeeman down there the Republican vote has been falling off for four years. Well, it has been falling off everywhere else for four years. [Laughter.] The gentlemen down in Texas who represent the Republican Party are handicapped by what is in the White House just the same as we are everywhere else in Republican circles. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, if it is good and sufficient reason to throw a delegate out because of Federal patronage, let us see where the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] will land.

There were at the Chicago convention over 200 delegates from States controlled absolutely by patronage. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] reminds me of Polonius. Hamlet, you know, took him out and showed him a cloud in the sky, and he said, "Polonius, that cloud looks like a camel." Polonius said, "Yes, my lord; it does look like a camel." "Oh, no;" said Hamlet, "it looks like a weasel." "Sure," said Polonius, "come to look at it right, it does look like a weasel." "Oh, no;" said Hamlet, "it is an elephant." "Why, of course," said Polonius, "anybody can see that it is an elephant."

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It looked like a bull moose. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. It looks like a bull moose to all Democrats. The political boss takes my friend from Wyoming and shows him Texas. He says, "Here are the Roosevelt delegates down in Texas. They ought to be thrown out because postmasters helped to put them in," and the gentleman from Wyoming says, "Sure. Throw them out. We do not want any Federal patronage delegates in Chicago."

Then the boss takes him over to Mississippi and says, "Here is a delegation made up of Federal office holders and postmasters, all for Taft. They are all right." And the gentleman from Wyoming raises his hand to heaven and says, "Of course they are all right." [Laughter.] "They ought to stay." Then the boss takes my friend to Indianapolis and says: "Behold, here is one of the wonders of the campaign—a Taft delegation elected by a primary. We are for the people and this delegation must be seated." And the gentleman responds: "Wonderful discovery! Of course, they must be seated. The primary must be acknowledged." And then the boss takes my friend to King County, Wash., and to Maricopa County in Arizona, and he says: "Here are delegations for Roosevelt. They were elected by the despised primary methods. The primary must be killed." And my friend answers and says: "Sure the primary is an evil. It opens the door to fraud. These delegations are wicked and they must be thrown out."

Now, let us see about Mississippi. There are three or four men down in Mississippi who control the Republican Party. "Why," the gentleman from Wyoming says, "there were some counties in Texas where not a single Republican vote was cast." That is true, but those counties were not represented in that convention. He did not tell you that. He wanted you to think delegates were fixed up from those counties. They were not, however.

But there were places in the South where in the last election not a single Republican vote was cast in a Republican district, and those congressional districts were represented in Chicago by a couple of postmasters. He says that Col. Lyon, the national committeeman from Texas, helps the Democrats. I am not going to dispute it, because I know nothing about it. But over in Florida, where there were two delegates, enthusiastic Republicans for Taft, who went to Chicago with their expenses paid, I suppose, and return tickets in their pockets, who came from districts where not a single Republican vote had been cast. What did they do for the Democracy?

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us see. The Republican party in Mississippi is controlled by three men: L. B. Moseley, clerk of the court; W. O. Ligon, one of the United States marshals in one of the districts; and a man by the name of Fred. W. Collins.

Now, let us see about the delegates from Mississippi to Chicago.

L. B. Moseley, clerk of the Federal court, jury commissioner, United States commissioner.

M. J. Mulvihill, postmaster at Vicksburg, salary $3,100.

L. K. Atwood, ex-collector of internal revenue.

Then comes a private citizen. God bless him! How lonely he must have felt in that delegation. [Laughter.]

J. M. Shumperi, juror selector.

J. F. Butler, postmaster at Holly Springs, salary $2,200.

E. H. McKissack, juror selector.

Louis Waldauer, postmaster at Greenville, salary $2,800.

J. W. Bell, postmaster at Pontotoc, salary $1,500.

W. W. Phillips, professional juror.

W. J. Price, postmaster at Meridian, salary $3,200.

Then another juror.

J. C. Tyler, postmaster at Biloxi and solicitor of funds from Federal officeholders, salary $2,500.

W. P. Locker, janitor of Federal building, salary $900.

E. F. Brenner, postmaster at Brookhaven, salary $2,500.

C. R. Ligon, United States deputy marshal, and son of the marshal, salary $1,200.

Wesley Crayton, professional juror and jury selector.

What about this family that is controlling the Republican Party in Mississippi? I have read you the delegates to the Republican national convention of which the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is so proud that there were delegates there not controlled by Federal patronage.

L. B. Moseley is the clerk of the Federal court. W. R. Moseley, a brother, is the collector of the port at Gulfport, Miss., with a salary of $3,000 per annum. R. O. Edwards is a foster brother and cousin and is postmaster in Jackson, with a salary of $3,300. Mrs. R. O. Edwards is assistant postmaster in Jackson, with a salary of $1,600. Thomas W. McAlpin is a brother-in-law, and he has a contract for carrying the mail. Miss Suzette McAlpin is a sister of Thomas McAlpin and is postmistress at Bolton, with a salary of $940. Frank L. Rattliff, another cousin, is a postmaster at Shaw, and he has a salary of $1,400. Then let us take up the Ligon family: W. O. Ligon is the United States marshal and he has a salary of $3,000 from the Federal Treasury. His son, C. R. Ligon, is a deputy United States marshal and gets a salary of $1,200. Jennie D. Ligon, the wife of W. O. Ligon, is postmistress at Gloster and has a salary of $1,500, Then there is Percy Ligon, W. O.'s son, who is assistant postmaster at Gloster, with a salary of $590.

Let us now take the other part of the trio, the Collins family: Fred W. Collins is United States marshal, with a salary of $3,000. W. A. Collins is a son of Fred and is postmaster at Hattiesburg, with a salary of $3,000. Seth W. Collins is an uncle to Walter and is postmaster at McComb City, at a salary of $2,300. Then there is J. N. Attkison, brother-in-law to Walter, who is postmaster at Summit, with a salary of $1,500. Walter Collins, son of Fred, also has a brother-in-law who is the postmaster at Tylertown, and he gets a salary of $1,500. F. W. Collins, jr., son of Fred, is deputy United States marshal and gets a salary of $1,200.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a few minutes longer.

Mr. BURLESON. How much more time does the gentleman want?

Mr. NORRIS. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to accommodate the gentleman from Nebraska, but we have a very important caucus called here for this evening. If the gentleman can get through in a few minutes, I shall not object to his request.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman prefer to go ahead for a few minutes to-night or to ask unanimous consent to proceed to-morrow?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish what I have to say to-night. Of course I recognize the fact that the gentleman from Wyoming consumed two hours and a half, but it is getting late, and I shall not find fault.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman understands that objection comes from the Democratic side.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly; I understand. If the gentleman desires to go on with the caucus, I will ask unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow I be allowed 30 minutes.

Mr. JAMES. Time to conclude the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to the gentleman going on to-morrow, but this evening there is business set apart.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand, and I am not finding fault.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18787, relating to the limitation of daily hours of labor on public works, etc., and had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal, I may be allowed to conclude the remarks which I began to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal, he be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire the gentleman to indicate some time.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe I shall take more than 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then, say one hour.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well, Mr. Speaker, one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to address the House to-morrow for one hour, if he so desires, immediately after the reading of the Journal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon a bill reported from the Committee on the Public Lands affecting certain lands in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Osage Indian bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous censent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EDWARDS, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. GARNER, indefinitely, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 25, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Acting Secretary of War submitting estimate of appropriation

for mileage to officers and contract surgeons, etc., in connection with the relief of sufferers from floods in the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys (H. Doc. No. 879), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8151) providing for the adjustment of the grant of lands in aid of the construction of the Corvallis and Yaquina Bay military wagon road and of conflicting claims to lands within the limits of said grant, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1054), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUDGER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 5494) to provide a site for the erection of a building to be known as the George Washington Memorial Building, to serve as the gathering place and headquarters of patriotic, scientific, medical, and other organizations interested in promoting the welfare of the American people, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1055), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 25611) to authorize the sale of certain lots in the Hot Springs Reservation for church and hospital purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1056), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5679) to amend section 2 of an act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases, approved June 25, 1910, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1057), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HEFLIN, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 340) making appropriation to be used in exterminating the army worm, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1058), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16997) for the relief of William Bell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1053), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 25935) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Cal., certain public lands in California and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra Forest Reserve, the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, and the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve, Cal., to the city of Los Angeles, Cal.," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 25936) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 25937) making the first Monday in September (Labor Day) a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 341) concerning contracts with Indian tribes or individual Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 342) to adopt a national air for the United States of America; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKMON (by request): A bill (H. R. 25938) for the relief of Frances C. Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 25939) granting an increase of pension to William T. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 25940) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Goff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 25941) granting a pension to Rebecca Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25942) to correct the military record of Wilson Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE: A bill (H. R. 25943) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Crossman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 25944) granting an increase of pension to John W. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 25945) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James W. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 25946) for the relief of Ephram Combs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 25947) granting a pension to Juliette Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25948) granting a pension to Barbara Scisinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25949) granting an increase of pension to Hiram A. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25950) granting an increase of pension to William D. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 25951) granting an increase of pension to Andrew W. Sponsler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 25952) granting a pension to Susan A. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 25953) granting a pension to Franklin D. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 25954) granting a pension to Daniel B. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 25955) granting an increase of pension to Richard Riddles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25956) granting an increase of pension to Julius Weddigen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25957) granting an increase of pension to S. L. Hotchkiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25958) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Stead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25959) granting an increase of pension to Isiah White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25960) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Crandall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25961) granting an increase of pension to Edwin C. Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25962) granting a pension to Mary Soper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25963) granting an increase of pension to John Metzger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25964) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Baldwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25965) granting a pension to Letitia M. Leepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25966) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Burroughs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25967) granting an increase of pension to George W. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25968) granting an increase of pension to W. H. McCallum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25969) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Ohio, favoring legislation for relief of the natives of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the International Dredge Workers' Association, Local No. 3, Toledo, Ohio, favoring passage of House bill 18787, for regulating and shortening the hours of men building and maintaining Government rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the Daughters of Liberty of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the International Dredge Workers' Protective Association, favoring passage of House bill 18787, providing for shorter hours for men building and maintaining Government rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York, protesting against the passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill (S. 6850); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Eckford C. DeKay, military secretary to the governor, Albany, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 2588, relative to improving the Naval Militia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of citizens of New York, favoring legislation regulating express rates and classification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of New York, protesting against any parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Photo-Engravers' Union, No. 1, of New York, protesting against the passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill (S. 6850); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Association of Piano Merchants of America, protesting against any change in the patent laws affecting price maintenance; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the St. Augustine Board of Trade, St. Augustine, Fla., favoring bill turning the powder house lot over to the city of St. Augustine for a public park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Hebrew veterans of the War with Spain, protesting against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C., protesting against the provision on page 109 of the sundry civil bill relative to reimbursing the United States amount due on one-half of the per capita cost of indigent patients in the Government Hospital for the Insane; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Washington Architectural Club, protesting against the annulling of the Tarsney Act relative to hiring Government architects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the National Shorthand Reporters' Association at Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 4036, making the United States district court official shorthand reporters a political appointment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Ernest A. Eggers and 75 other citizens of Brooklyn, favoring passage of the Roddenbery antiprize-fight bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, of New York, and the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York State, protesting against the passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill (S. 6850); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of P. C. Drescher, Sacramento, Cal.; Wellman Peck Co., San Francisco, Cal.; and Stetson, Barret Co., San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 4667, requiring weights and measures be shown on labels and brands of food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Louis R. Dempster, San Francisco, Cal.; Lucy Fay Lawrence, Los Gatos, Cal.; and John C. Spencer, San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 12532, establishing a national park at Mount Olympus, Wash.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring appropriation for the Diplomatic and Consular Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Oakland, Cal., favoring legislation for construction of a flood-water canal from the San Joaquin River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of W. A. Winn, Hollister, Cal., and John W. Davy, San Jose, Cal., favoring the passage of a parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of N. B. Taylor, San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of bill for building the Lincoln memorial highway; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., favoring dismissal of Judge C. J. Hanford for canceling the citizenship papers of Leonard Oleson for being a member of the Socialist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Nelson A. Miles Camp, No. 10, United Spanish War Veterans, San Francisco, Cal., favoring appointment of qualified United Spanish War veteran on the Board of Pension Examiners; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Richmond, Cal., favoring legislation for building a bridge across the San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., and the Chamber of Commerce of Oakland, Cal., favoring free use of the Panama Canal by American vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 22589, for improving consular and diplomatic buildings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., and A. K. Salz, San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 18327, for preparing a national directory of commercial organizations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Berkeley, Cal., and the Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of the 1-cent postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the United States Customs Civil Service Retirement Association, and the Pennsylvania Civil Service Reform Association, protesting against passage of section 5 in House bill 24023, making a five-year tenure of office of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 17470, pensioning widows and orphans of the Spanish-American War, etc.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of P. C. Drescher, of Sacramento, Cal., and R. H. Bennett, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 22526, creating uniform weight and branding laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal., and of George H. Hahn, of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of House bill 23417, removing price restrictions; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of Senate bill 122, creating a board of river regulation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of America, protesting against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, protesting against the passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill (S. 6650); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, protesting against the passage of any parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of Wilhelm Reiker, of Cedar Bluffs, Nebr., protesting against the wearing of sectarian garb in Government schools; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of citizens of Florida, favoring passage of House bill 16313, providing for the erection of an American Indian memorial and museum building in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the State Liability Board of Awards, Columbus, Ohio, relative to the workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of America, protesting against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of citizens of New York, protesting against the passage of any parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.